

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



129 826

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



**COLLECTED WORKS
OF
V. I. LENIN**

*Completely revised, edited and annotated.
The only edition authorized by the
V. I. Lenin Institute, Moscow*

LENIN

VOLUME XX

THE REVOLUTION OF 1917

FROM THE MARCH REVOLUTION
TO THE JULY DAYS

BOOK I



NEW YORK
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1929, by
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.

Printed in the U. S. A.

Composed and printed by union labor

Translated by

JOSHUA KUNITZ and MOISSAYE J. OLGIN

Edited by

ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION	13
LETTERS, ARTICLES AND SPEECHES FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE MARCH REVOLUTION TO THE RETURN TO RUSSIA	17-88
Two Letters to A. M. Kollontai	19
Draft of Theses of March 17, 1917	23
Letters from Afar	27-63
First Letter: The First Stage of the First Revolution	27
Second Letter: The New Government and the Pro- letariat	36
Third Letter: On Proletarian Militia	45
Fourth Letter: How to Get Peace	56
Fifth Letter: Problems of Revolutionary Proletarian Organisation of the State	62
The Revolution in Russia and the Tasks of the Workers of All Countries	64
Letter to J. S. Hanecki	69
Tricks of the Republican Chauvinists	74
Report on the Tasks of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party in the Russian Revolution	77
Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers	82
 ARTICLES, REPORTS AND SPEECHES IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE RETURN TO RUSSIA	89-196
How We Arrived	91
Speech Dealing with the Question of the Journey through Germany, Delivered at the Session of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet . . .	94
Speech Delivered at a Caucus of the Bolshevik Mem- bers of the All-Russian Conference of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies	95
Two Worlds	104
On the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution	106
In Louis Blanc's Footsteps	111
On Dual Power	115
Letters on Tactics	118

	PAGE
The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution (Proposed Platform of a Proletarian Party)	130-157
The Class Character of the Revolution	130
The Foreign Policies of the New Government	131
Unique Dual Power and Its Class Meaning	132
The Peculiarity of the Tactics Following from the Above	135
Revolutionary Defencism and Its Class Meaning	136
How the War Can Be Ended	138
The New Type of State Arising in Our Revolution	139
The Agrarian and the National Programmes	142
Nationalisation of Banks and Capitalist Syndicates	144
The State of Affairs in the Socialist International	145
The Breakdown of the Zimmerwald International.	
The Necessity of Forming a Third International	150
A Name for Our Party Which Would be Scientifically Sound and Conducive to Proletarian Class Thinking	154
Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat	158
Speech Delivered at a Meeting of Soldiers of the Izmailov Regiment	168
A Shameless Lie of the Capitalists	171
The War and the Provisional Government	173
In the Footsteps of the <i>Russkaia Volia</i>	176
A League of Falsehood	178
Banks and Ministers	181
An Important Exposé	182
To the Soldiers and Sailors	183
Against the Pogrom Makers	186
Citizens! Understand the Nature of the Methods Used by the Capitalists of All Countries	189
“Voluntary Agreement” between Landowners and Peasants?	192
An Honest Voice in a Chorus of Slanderers	193
The Soldiers and the Land	195
 THE PETROGRAD CITY CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY	197-216
Report on the Political Situation and the Attitude Towards the Provisional Government	199

	PAGE
Concluding Remarks Concerning the Report on the Political Situation	205
Resolution on the Attitude Towards the Provisional Government	207
Two Rebuttals Made During the Discussion of the Resolution on the Attitude Towards the Provisional Government	209
Draft Resolution on the War	209
Two Rebuttals Made During the Discussion on the Question of Municipal Elections	214
Resolution on the Municipal Question	215
 ARTICLES, SPEECHES, RESOLUTIONS, ETC., ON THE EVE OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL [MAY] CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY	217-268
The Congress of Peasant Deputies	219
On the Return of the Emigrants	222
Our Views (Reply to the Resolution of the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies) .	223
How They Have Attached Themselves to the Capitalists	227
On Proletarian Militia	229
Collapse?	233
The Note of the Provisional Government	234
One of the Basic Questions	236
With Ikons against Cannons, with Phrases against Capital	240
The Logic of Citizen V. Chernov	242
Mr. Plekhanov's Unsuccessful Attempts at Extricating Himself	243
A Resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party	245
Honest Defencism Reveals Itself	248
Insane Capitalists or Feeble-Minded Social-Democrats	251
Advice or Order of Shingarev, and Advice of One Local Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies	253
Resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party	254
Lessons of the Crisis	256
How a Simple Question is Muddled	260
"Disgrace" as Understood by the Capitalists and the Proletarians	262

	PAGE
Interview with E. Torniainen	264
Foolish Malicious Glee	265
Draft of Theses for a Resolution on the Soviets	267
 THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL [MAY] CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY	269-319
Speech Delivered at the Opening of the Conference	271
Report on the Political Situation	271
Concluding Remarks in Connection with the Report on the Political Situation	285
Speech on the Proposed Calling of an International Socialist Conference	287
Speech on the Attitude Toward the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies	291
Speech in Favour of the Resolution Relating to the War	291
Report on the Agrarian Question	302
Reply to N. S. Angarsky During the Debate on the Agrarian Question	307
Report on the Revision of the Party Programme	308
Speech on the National Question	310
Speech on the Situation within the International and the Tasks of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party	315
Speech in Favour of the Resolution on the Political Situation	315
Concluding Remarks at the Closing of the Conference	318
Preface to <i>Imperialism as the Final Stage of Capitalism</i>	320
 MATERIALS RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME	323-343
Introduction to the Pamphlet, <i>Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme</i>	325
Proposed Changes in the Theoretical, Political and Several Other Parts of the Programme	326
Concerning the Remarks of the Commission of the All-Russian April Conference	330
Draft of Revised Programme. The Old and the New Texts of the Programme	332
EXPLANATORY NOTES	345

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE
Facsimile of the First Page of Lenin's Letter to A. M. Kollontai, March 16, 1917	18
Facsimile of the First Page of the "Second Letter" of Lenin's "Letters from Afar," March 22, 1917	90
First Page of the Zürich <i>Volksrecht</i> , March 31, 1917, Showing an Account of Lenin's Lecture on "The Tasks of the R. S.-D. L. P. in the Russian Revolution," Entitled "Lenin on the Russian Revolution"	198
First Page of the <i>Pravda</i> , April 20, 1917, Showing the Beginning of Lenin's Article, "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution"	218
Facsimile of the First Page of Lenin's Article, "To the Soldiers and Sailors," April, 1917	270
Title Page of the Pamphlet, <i>Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme</i> , Petrograd, 1917	324

PREFACE TO THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION

The present volume covers the period of the first four months of the Revolution of 1917—from the middle of March to the middle of July; from the time when Lenin, living in Zürich as an exile, received the first authentic news of the outbreak of the revolution to the critical July Days when he was forced to go into hiding.

The July crisis represents the dividing line between the two periods of the Revolution of 1917—the overthrow of tsarism in March and the defeat of the bourgeoisie in November—not only in point of *time* but also in point of *content*. Constituting a decisive turn in the development of the proletarian revolution in Russia, it therefore offers a natural chronological limit for Volume XX of the *Collected Works*, which, together with Volume XXI, comprises all of Lenin's utterances on the Revolution of 1917.

The new Russian edition published by the V. I. Lenin Institute, which has served as a basis for the present definitive English translation, has been considerably enlarged as compared with the previous editions. All of the writings relating to this period and established as belonging to the pen of Lenin, as, for example, more than 30 unsigned articles from the *Pravda*, as well as all the speeches of that time of which records have been preserved, have been included in this volume. A few letters of special political importance have also been added. These are the two letters to A. M. Kollontai of March 16 and 17, which represent Lenin's first reaction to the news of the Russian Revolution, and the letter to Hanecki of March 30 which shows Lenin's political line and his anxiousness to extricate himself from provincial Switzerland in order to proceed without delay to revolutionary Russia.

Lenin's speeches reproduced in this volume presented a special problem. The difficulty of reporting speeches accurately, even with the best technical facilities, is well known. Many of the speeches of this period, however, were not reported stenographically but only recorded in minutes. But even when stenographic reports had been made, Lenin was able to correct them personally only in very rare instances. Lenin himself repeatedly pointed to this

defect and refused to be responsible for the textual formulation of the reports of his speeches. The careful reader of these speeches, particularly in this volume, will meet these defects himself. Many of the speeches do not reproduce Lenin's words but his train of thought. And in parts even this is broken off, as is particularly the case, for example, in the "Speech Delivered at a Caucus of the Bolshevik Members of the All-Russian Conference of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies" (see pp. 95-103, Book I of this volume). Such gaps are indicated by several dots. In a few cases what are probably the missing words have been supplied in brackets. No changes have been made in the stenographic reports or minute records.

The large quantity of material and the desire to avoid making it too bulky led to the division of the English translation of this volume and its publication in two books. The first of these extends to the beginning of June; the second ends with the July Days.

For the convenience of the reader, a number of appendices have been added, consisting of explanatory notes, biographical notes of persons referred to in the text, bibliography, documents and other materials of historic importance (such as documents dealing with Lenin's passage through Germany, two articles by L. Kamenev, proclamations, resolutions and official party statements with which Lenin deals in his articles or speeches), a chronology of events and a calendar of Lenin's life at that time. The documents and chronologies should give the reader the historical background and contribute to a better understanding of the events of the period.

The appendices as a whole will be found at the end of Book II, with the exception of the explanatory notes which have been divided between the two books. Since the purpose of these notes is to facilitate the understanding of the text, that part which refers directly to material in Book I has been placed at the end of that book. The explanatory notes in Book II continue the numbering of the notes in the first book. These explanatory notes are based upon those in the Russian edition published under the supervision of the V. I. Lenin Institute. In some cases, however, amplifications or additional notes have been made by the editor where these seemed desirable for readers of the English translation.

Lenin's own notes have been reproduced as footnotes to the text. Wherever footnotes by the editor have been added, they have been designated as such. Notes in the text proper by the editor have been placed in brackets and designated as his.

All of the material has been chronologically arranged, with the exception of the "Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme" (see pp. 323-343, Book I of this volume). These have been placed after the material on the April (May) Conference, although the first part was written before this conference and served as material for it.

All dates following the Russian old style calendar, which is thirteen days behind the calendar of Western Europe, and used in the Russian edition, have been changed to new style in accord with our own practice.

The bulk of the translation of this volume has been made by Joshua Kunitz, the remainder having been done into English by Moissaye J. Olgin who also revised the translation as a whole.

Facsimile illustrations were supplied by the V. I. Lenin Institute whose gracious co-operation at all stages of the work has made possible the publication of this volume in English.

LETTERS, ARTICLES AND SPEECHES FROM THE
BEGINNING OF THE MARCH REVOLUTION TO THE
RETURN TO RUSSIA
FROM MARCH 16 TO APRIL 15, 1917

16. III. 1917.

9

Дорогой Брать! Спасибо за письмо
и поздравления. — публикации "(14), №. 6
Надежд Кадетской газеты. Судя по тому —
Мартинов + Чумак + Красин", "Санкт-П.
сторону" сбрано. Жаль....

"Ну, что же! Так, пожалуйста" — да... ну что
(из исподне вижу, что "боян") публикации "За
Свободу и народную демократию" не
появились в "Санкт-Петербурге", а в Москве, это
зато, "правда" — есть такая "Санкт-Петербургская", позади
"Санкт-Петербург + Красина" в К. М.

Нет никакого сомнения в том. И если бы
такой же С.Д. не вспомнил о публикации
своего письма в газете "Мартинова + Чумак".
Так, если не Мартинов + Красин? —
Мартинов — — был членом Чемберт Пара-
тиеса! Но неизвестно, как Jr. Красин
стал членом Чемберта (когда они в один
известный Революционный комитет, или
Комитет рабочих депутатов, то есть, в Кон-
грессе рабочих депутатов?) — да и Красин
членом, то есть, членом Чемберта, не
был. Чемберт — это публикация из Москвы —
Красин + Чумак! Извините за бесполезные
вопросы!

Честное слово — нечестно, про-
шу прощения за ошибку. С.Д. Красин.
Завтра же буду звать Чумака (если он жив!).
Завтра же буду звать Чумака (если он жив!).
Честное слово — нечестно, прошу прощения.
С.Д. Красин, если я ошиблась, извините, я
не звала Чумака, потому что не звала Чумака
(Красин + Чумак) из-за бесполезных вопросов.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1917

TWO LETTERS TO A. M. KOLLONTAI¹

I

March 16, 1917.

DEAR A. M.:

We have just received the second series of government telegrams concerning the revolution of March 14 in Petrograd [now Lenin-grad]. The workers have been fighting in bloody battles for a week, yet Miliukov plus Guchkov plus Kerensky are in power! The same "old" European pattern. . . .

Well, what of it! This "first stage of the first revolution" bred by the war will be neither final nor confined to Russia. We, of course, retain our opposition to the defence of the fatherland, to the imperialist slaughter directed by Shingarev plus the Kerenskys and Co.

All our slogans remain the same; in the last issue of the *Social-Democrat*² we spoke plainly of the possibility of a government "of Miliukov and Guchkov, if not of Miliukov and Kerensky." It has turned out that all three are in it. Lovely! We shall see how the People's Freedom Party³ (which commands a majority in the new Cabinet, Konovalov being inclined rather "to the Left," while Kerensky is decidedly more to the Left!) will give the people freedom, bread, and peace. . . . We shall see!

Now, it is most urgent to establish our press, and to organise the workers into a *revolutionary* Social-Democratic Party. Chkhenkeli will have (he has promised!) to provide the money for the "defence of the fatherland." As to Mr. Chkhcheidze, though he delivered extremely radical speeches *during the revolution* or on the eve of it (when even Yefremov spoke in a most r-r-revolutionary manner), he does not, of course, deserve the *slightest* confidence after all the "politics" he pursued relative to the Potresovs and Co.,

and to Chkhenkeli, etc. It would be the greatest misfortune were the Cadets⁴ to promise a legal labour party, and were our people to "unite" with Chkhheidze and Co.!

But that will not happen. First, the Cadets will allow nobody to form a legal labour party, except Messrs. Potresov and Co. Second, even if they do allow it, we shall create, as before, *our* own party, most assuredly combining legal work with illegal.

Never again along the lines of the Second International! *Never again* with Kautsky! By all means *a more revolutionary* programme and more revolutionary tactics (K. Liebknecht, the American Socialist Labour Party,⁵ the Dutch Marxists,⁶ etc., show elements of such programme and tactics), and by all means a combination of legal and illegal work. Republican propaganda; war against imperialism; revolutionary propaganda, as heretofore, agitation, and struggle for an *international* proletarian revolution and for the conquest of power by the "Soviets of Workers' Deputies" (but not by the Cadet fakers).

. . . After the "great rebellion" of 1905, the "glorious revolution" of 1917!⁷

Kindly forward this letter to Liudmila, also send me a few words as to how far we agree, or disagree, and what are the plans of A. M., etc. Should our Deputies⁸ be released we must by all means bring one to Scandinavia for a couple of weeks.

With firm handshake,

Yours,

LENIN.

II

March 17, 1917.

DEAR A. M.:

We have just received your telegram, which is so worded as to sound almost ironic (much good it will do to send "instructions" from here, when information is so pitifully scanty, while there are in Petrograd not only leading party members but also officially designated representatives of the Central Committee!).

I have just read a telegram of the Petrograd Telegraph Agency of March 17, containing the programme of the new government and Bonar Law's declaration to the effect that the Tsar had not yet abdicated, and that his whereabouts were unknown.

Yesterday it seemed that the Guchkov-Miliukov government was fully victorious, that it had already entered into an agreement with the dynasty; to-day it appears that the dynasty is no more, that the Tsar has fled, evidently making ready for a counter-revolution! . . .

We have started working on the theses, which we may complete to-night. Of course, we shall forward them to you immediately. If possible, wait until you get these theses, which will correct (or supplant) the things I am now writing in my own name.

Zinoviev and I have just succeeded in preparing the outline of the theses. It is the first draft, editorially quite unsatisfactory (we shall, of course, not publish it in the present form), but which, I hope, gives an idea as to the fundamentals.*

We urgently ask you to acquaint Youri and Eugenie Bosh, as well as Liudmila, with this, and to send us at least a few words before you leave. Also be sure to arrange with some one remaining in Norway about forwarding *our* material to Russia and the *Russian* to us. Please do it, and ask the one remaining (perhaps a Norwegian who knows German, French, or English) to be *very* punctual. We shall send money to cover expenses.

In my opinion, our main task is to guard against getting entangled in foolish attempts at "unity" with the social-patriots⁹ (or, what is still more dangerous, with the wavering ones, like the Organisation Committee,¹⁰ Trotsky and Co.) and to continue the work of *our own* party in a consistently *internationalist* spirit.

Our immediate task is to widen the scope of our work, to organise the masses, to arouse new social strata, the backward elements, the rural population, the domestic servants, to form nuclei in the army for the purpose of carrying on a systematic and detailed *exposé* of the new government, to prepare the seizure of power by the *Soviets of Workers' Deputies*. Only this power can give bread, peace, and freedom.

Right now, complete the rout of reaction; refuse *all* confidence or support to the new government (not a shadow of confidence to Kerensky, Gvozdev, Chkhenkeli, Chkhheidze and Co.); keep armed watchfulness; armed preparation of a broader base for a *higher* stage.

If there is freedom of the press, republish (as material for a history of the recent past) the things we have written here, and

* See p. 23 of this book.—Ed.

notify us by telegraph whether we can be of help by sending our writings via Scandinavia. We fear we shall not be able to leave this accursed Switzerland so soon.

I wish you the greatest possible success!

With firm handshake,

Yours,

LENIN.

P.S.—I am afraid that the epidemic of “sheer” enthusiasm may now spread in Petrograd, without a systematic effort towards the creation of a party of a *new* type, which must *by no means* resemble those of the Second International. Spread out! Arouse new strata! Awaken new initiative, form new organisations in every layer, and *prove* to them that *peace* can come only with the armed Soviet of Workers’ Deputies in power.

First published in the *Lenin Collection [Leninsky Sbornik]*, Vol. II, 1924.

DRAFT OF THESES OF MARCH 17, 1917¹¹

NEWS from Russia reaching us in Zürich at this writing, March 17, 1917, is so scanty, and events in our country are developing so rapidly, that one must be extremely cautious in forming a judgment as to the present state of affairs.

Yesterday's telegrams presented the situation as if the Tsar had already abdicated and a government of Cadets and Octobrists¹² had already concluded an agreement with other representatives of the Romanov dynasty. To-day's papers publish reports from England to the effect that the Tsar has not yet abdicated, and that his whereabouts are unknown! It means, then, that the Tsar is trying to offer resistance, to organise a party and perhaps an army to restore the monarchy; it is even possible that, in order to deceive the people, the Tsar, if he should succeed in making his escape from Russia or in gaining the support of a portion of the army, will issue a manifesto announcing an immediate, separate peace signed by him with Germany!

Under these circumstances the task of the proletariat is rather complicated. It is perfectly obvious that the proletariat must organise more thoroughly, must muster all its forces, arm itself and strengthen and develop its alliance with all the layers of the labouring masses in city and country, in order to offer merciless resistance to tsarist reaction and to crush completely the tsarist monarchy.

On the other hand, the new government that has seized power in Petrograd, or, rather, has snatched it from the hands of the proletariat after the latter had won a victory in bloody battles, consists of the liberal bourgeoisie and landowners, who have harnessed Kerensky, that representative of the democratic peasantry and, perhaps, of a section of workers who have forgotten their internationalism and have been lured into following the bourgeoisie. The new government consists of avowed supporters and defenders of the imperialist war with Germany, the war now waged in league with the imperialist governments of England and France for the

sake of robbing and subjugating foreign lands—Armenia, Galicia, Constantinople, etc.

The new government can give to the peoples of Russia (or to those nations to which we are bound by war) neither peace, nor bread, nor complete freedom, and for that reason the working class must continue its struggle for Socialism and for peace, must utilise the new situation for that purpose and explain it to the large masses of the people.

The new government cannot bring peace, because it represents the capitalists and the landowners; and because it is bound by treaties and financial obligations to the capitalists of England and France. Russian Social-Democracy, to remain truly internationalist, must immediately, and before everything else, explain to the masses anxious for peace the impossibility of obtaining it while the present government is in power. In its first proclamation to the people (March 17),¹⁸ the government uttered not a word about the main and basic question of the present moment, peace. It keeps secret the predatory treaties made by tsarism with England, France, Italy, Japan, etc. It wishes to conceal from the people the truth about its war programme, and the fact that it is for war, for victory over Germany. It cannot do the thing that the peoples must needs have done, *i.e.*, directly and openly propose to all the warring nations that an armistice be immediately declared, to be followed by a peace concluded on the basis of full freedom for the colonies, as well as for all the subject and dependent nations. To realise this, we must have a workers' government, allied first with the mass of the poorest village population, and second, with the revolutionary workers of all the warring countries.

The new government cannot give the people bread. And no amount of freedom will satisfy masses suffering hunger because of lack of supplies, because of their bad distribution, and, chiefly, because they were cornered by the landlords and capitalists. To give bread to the people, one must resort to revolutionary measures against the landowners and the capitalists; such measures, however, can be carried out only by a workers' government.

Nor can the new government give the people full freedom, although in its Manifesto of March 17, 1917, it spoke exclusively of political freedom, ignoring completely other no less important questions. The new government has already made an attempt to enter into an agreement with the Romanov dynasty, for, disregard-

ing the will of the people, it has offered to recognise the dynasty on condition that Nicholas II abdicate and that some one of the Romanov family be appointed as Regent for his son.¹⁴ The new government in its Manifesto promises all sorts of liberties, but does nothing to fulfil its plain and absolute duty to put these liberties into effect, to institute the election of officers, etc., by the soldiers; to set a date for the election to the city councils of Petrograd, Moscow, etc., on the basis of universal, and not merely male, suffrage; to throw all government and city buildings open for mass meetings; to call for elections to all local institutions and zemstvos¹⁵ on the basis of the same really universal suffrage; to abolish all restrictions on local self-government; to remove all officials appointed from above to supervise local government; to put into effect not only freedom of religion, but also freedom from religion; to immediately separate school from church and bureaucratic control, etc.

The entire Manifesto of the new government, published on March 17, inspires one with the greatest distrust, for it consists only of promises, and does not carry into life any of the most essential measures that could and should be fully realised right now.

In its programme the new government does not say a word about the eight-hour day or other improvements in the economic condition of the workers; it says nothing about land for the peasants, about transferring to the peasants, without compensation, all of the landowners' land. By keeping silent on these vital questions, it reveals its capitalist and landowning nature.

Only a workers' government, basing itself, first, on the vast majority of the peasant population, the rural workers and the poorest peasants; second, on an alliance with the revolutionary workers of the warring countries, can give peace, bread, and complete freedom to the people.

The revolutionary proletariat, therefore, cannot but view the revolution of March 14 as its first, though far from complete, victory along its glorious course; it cannot but assume the task of continuing the struggle to achieve a democratic republic and Socialism.

To accomplish this, the proletariat and the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party¹⁶ must first of all utilise the relative and incomplete freedom which is being instituted by the new government, but which only a further, more persistent and stubborn revolutionary struggle can broaden and make secure.

It is necessary that all the toiling masses of the country and city, and also the army, should learn the truth about the present government and its actual position on essential questions. It is necessary to organise Soviets of Workers' Deputies and to arm the workers; it is necessary to carry proletarian organisation into the army (which has also been promised political rights by the government) and into the village; it is particularly necessary to have a separate class-organisation of hired agricultural workers.

Only when the largest possible masses of the population are enlightened, only when they are organised, can complete victory of the next stage of the revolution and the conquest of power by a workers' government, be secured.

To accomplish this task, which in revolutionary times and under the influence of the painful lessons of the war can be grasped by the people in an immeasurably shorter time than under ordinary circumstances, it is necessary that the party of the revolutionary proletariat, which has remained loyal to internationalism and has not yielded to the lie of bourgeois phrases deceitfully advocating "defence of the fatherland" in the present imperialist and predatory war, should retain independence of ideas and organisation.

Not only the present government, but even a democratic-bourgeois republican government, were it to consist only of Kerensky and other Narodnik¹⁷ and "Marxian" social-patriots, would be unable to rid the people of the imperialist war, and to guarantee peace.

This is why we cannot enter into any blocs, alliances, nor even agreements with either the defencists¹⁸ among the workers, nor with the group represented by Gvozdev-Potresov-Chkhenkeli-Kerensky, etc., nor with people who, like Chkhheidze and others, take a vacillating and indefinite stand on this fundamental question. Such agreements would not only inject a lie into the consciousness of the masses, and make them dependent upon the imperialist bourgeoisie of Russia, but they would also weaken and undermine the leadership of the proletariat in the cause of ridding the people of imperialist wars and guaranteeing a true and lasting peace among the workers' governments of all countries.

LETTERS FROM AFAR¹⁹

FIRST LETTER

THE FIRST STAGE OF THE FIRST REVOLUTION

THE first revolution arising out of the imperialist World War has broken out. This first revolution will, certainly, not be the last.

The first stage of this first revolution, namely, the *Russian* revolution of March 14, 1917, is over, according to the scanty information at the writer's disposal in Switzerland. Surely this first stage of our revolution will not be the last one.

How could such a "miracle" happen; that in eight days—the period indicated by M. Miliukov in his boastful telegram to all the representatives of Russia abroad—a monarchy that had maintained itself for centuries, and continued to maintain itself during three years of tremendous national class conflicts of 1905-1907, could utterly collapse?

There are no miracles in nature or in history, yet every sudden turn in history, including every revolution, presents such a wealth of material, it unfolds such unexpectedly peculiar co-ordinations of forms of conflict and alignment of fighting forces, that there is much that must appear miraculous to the burgher's mind.

A combination of a whole series of conditions of world-wide historic importance was required for the tsarist monarchy to collapse in a few days. Let us point out the principal ones.

Without the three years, 1905-1907, of tremendous class conflicts and of revolutionary energy of the Russian proletariat, this second revolution could not possibly have had the rapid progress indicated in the fact that its *first* phase was accomplished in a few days. The first revolution (1905) ploughed the ground deeply and uprooted the prejudices of centuries; it awakened to political life and struggle millions of workers and tens of millions of peasants. The first revolution revealed to the workers and peasants, as well as to the world, all the classes (and all the principal parties) of Russian society in their true character; the actual alignment of their in-

terests, their powers and modes of action, their immediate and ultimate objectives. This first revolution, and the succeeding counter-revolutionary period (1907-1914), fully revealed the nature of the tsarist monarchy as having reached the "utmost limit"; it exposed all the infamy and vileness, all the cynicism and corruption of the tsarist clique dominated by that monster, Rasputin; it exposed all the bestiality of the Romanov family—that band of assassins which bathed Russia in the blood of the Jews, the workers, the revolutionaries—those landowners, "first among peers," who owned millions of acres of land and would stoop to any brutality, to any crime—ready to ruin or crush any section of the population, however numerous, in order to preserve the "sacred property rights" for themselves and for their class.

Without the revolution of 1905-1907, without the counter-revolution of 1907-1914, it would have been impossible to secure so clear a "self-determination" of all classes of the Russian people and of all the peoples inhabiting Russia, a clarification of the relation of these classes to each other and to the tsarist monarchy, as transpired during the eight days of the March revolution. This eight-day revolution, if we may express ourselves in terms of metaphors, was "performed" after a dozen informal as well as dress rehearsals; the "actors" knew each other and their rôles, their places, and the entire setting; they knew every detail through and through, down to the last more or less significant shade of political tendency and mode of action.

But, in order that the first great revolution of 1905, which Messrs. Guchkov and Miliukov and their satellites condemned as a "great rebellion" should, after the lapse of a dozen years, lead to the "glorious revolution" of 1917—so termed by the Guchkovs and Miliukovs because (for the *present*) it has put them into power—there was still needed a great, mighty, all-powerful "regisseur," who was, on the one hand, in a position to accelerate the course of history on a grand scale, and, on the other, to produce world-wide crises of unheard-of intensity: economic, political, national and international. In addition to an unusual acceleration of world history, there were also needed particularly sharp historic turns so that during one of them the blood-stained chariot of tsarism might be overturned in a trice.

This all-powerful "regisseur," this mighty accelerator of events, was the imperialist World War.

Now it can no longer be doubted that this war is world-wide, for the United States and China have been half dragged in already, and to-morrow will be completely involved in it.

Nor can it any longer be doubted that the war is imperialistic on both sides. Only the capitalists and their satellites, the social-patriots and social-chauvinists, can deny or suppress this fact. Both the German and the Anglo-French bourgeoisie are waging war for the grabbing of foreign territory, for the strangulation of small nations, for financial supremacy over the world, for the division and redistribution of colonies, for saving the tottering capitalist régime by means of deceiving and disuniting the workers in the various countries.

It was objectively inevitable that the imperialist war should immensely quicken and unusually sharpen the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and transform itself into a civil war between hostile classes.

This transformation has been started by the March revolution, whose first stage has shown us, first, a joint attack on tsarism delivered by two forces: on the one hand, the whole bourgeois and landowning class of Russia, with all their unenlightened followers and very enlightened managers, in the persons of the Anglo-French ambassadors and capitalists; and, on the other, the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

These three political camps, three fundamental political forces: (1) The tsarist monarchy, the head of the feudal landowning class, the head of the old bureaucracy and of the higher military commanders; (2) the Russia of the bourgeoisie and landowners represented by the Octobrists and Cadets, with the petty bourgeoisie in their wake; (3) the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, seeking for allies among the entire proletariat and the whole mass of the poorest population—these three fundamental political forces have revealed themselves with utmost clarity even in the first eight days of the "first stage." This is evident even to such an observer as the present writer who is far away from the scene of events and is compelled to confine himself to the meagre dispatches of foreign papers.

But before going into further detail in this matter, I must come back to that portion of my letter which is devoted to a factor of first importance, namely, the imperialist World War.

The belligerent powers, the belligerent groups of capitalists, the

"masters" of the capitalist system, and the slave-drivers of capitalist slavery, have been shackled to each other by the war with chains of iron. *One bloody lump*, that is the socio-political life of the historic period through which we are now passing.

The Socialists who deserted to the bourgeoisie at the beginning of the war, all the Davids and Scheidemanns in Germany, the Plekhanovs, Potresovs, Gvozdevs and Co. in Russia, have long been shouting lustily against the "illusions" of the revolutionists, against the "illusions" of the Basel Manifesto,²⁰ against the "dream farce" of turning the imperialist war into civil war. They have sung hymns of praise to the alleged strength, tenacity and adaptability of capitalism, while they were aiding the capitalists in "adapting," taming, deceiving and disuniting the working classes of the various countries!

But "he who laughs last laughs best." The bourgeoisie was not able to delay for very long the coming of the revolutionary crisis produced by the war. This crisis is growing with irresistible force in all countries, beginning with Germany where, according to a recent observer who visited that country, there is "hunger organised with the ability of genius," and down to England and France where hunger is also looming, though it is not so "wonderfully" organised.

It is natural that the tsarist Russia, where disorganisation was monstrous, where the proletariat is the most revolutionary in the world (not due to any specific characteristics, but because of the vivid traditions of "1905"²¹), the revolutionary crisis should have burst forth earlier than anywhere else. The crisis was hastened by a number of most serious defeats inflicted on Russia and her allies. These defeats disorganised the entire old mechanism of government and the entire old system; they aroused the indignation of *all* classes of the population; they incensed the army and largely wiped out the old body of commanders hailing from the backward nobility and particularly from the rotten officialdom, replacing it with a young and buoyant one of a predominantly bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and declassed origin.

But, if military defeats played the rôle of a negative factor that hastened the outbreak, the alliance of Anglo-French finance-capital, of Anglo-French imperialism, with the Octobrist and Constitutional-Democratic capital of Russia appeared as a factor that speeded this crisis.

This highly important phase of the situation is, for obvious reasons, not mentioned by the Anglo-French press while maliciously emphasised by the German. We Marxists must face the truth soberly, being confused neither by the official lies, the sugary diplomatic and ministerial lies of one group of imperialist belligerents, nor by the sniggering and smirking of its financial and military rivals of the other belligerent group. The whole course of events in the March revolution shows clearly that the English and French embassies with their agents and "associates," who had long made the most desperate efforts to prevent a "separate" agreement and a separate peace between Nicholas II (let us hope and strive that he be the last) and Wilhelm II, strove directly to dethrone Nicholas Romanov.²²

Let us not harbour any illusions.

The fact that the revolution succeeded so quickly and, apparently, at the first superficial glance, so "radically," is due to an unusual historical conjuncture where there combined, in a strikingly "favourable" manner, absolutely dissimilar movements, absolutely different class interests, absolutely opposed political and social tendencies. There was the conspiracy of the Anglo-French imperialists who encouraged Miliukov, Guchkov and Co. to seize power, with the object of prolonging the imperialist war, with the object of conducting the war more savagely and obstinately, with the object of slaughtering new millions of Russian workers and peasants, in order that the Guchkovs might obtain Constantinople; the French, Syria; the English capitalists, Mesopotamia, etc. This, on the one side. On the other, there was a profound proletarian and popular mass movement (of the entire poorest population of the cities and villages) of a revolutionary character, for bread, for peace, for real freedom.

The revolutionary workers and soldiers have destroyed the infamous tsarist monarchy to its very foundations, being neither elated nor constrained by the fact that, at certain brief historic moments of an exceptional combination of circumstances, they are aided by the struggle of Buchanan, Guchkov, Miliukov and Co., who simply desire to replace one monarch by another.

Thus, and only thus, did it occur. Thus, and only thus, must be the view of the politician who is not afraid of the truth, who soberly weighs the interrelation of social forces in a revolution, who evaluates every given moment not only from the viewpoint of

deceptive practices of the bourgeois politicians, must teach the people not to believe in words, but to depend wholly on their own strength, on their own organisation, on their own unity, and on their own arms."

The government of the Octobrists and Cadets, of the Guchkovs and Miliukovs, could give neither peace, nor bread, nor freedom, even if it were sincere in its desire to do so.

It cannot give peace because it is a government for war, a government for the continuation of the imperialist slaughter, a government of conquest, a government that has not uttered one word to renounce the tsarist policy of seizure of Armenia, Galicia, Turkey, of capturing Constantinople, of reconquering Poland, Courland, Lithuania, etc. This government is bound hand and foot by Anglo-French imperialist capital. Russian capital is merely one branch of the world "firm" known as "England and France" manipulating hundreds of billions of rubles.

It cannot give bread, since it is a bourgeois government. At best it may give the people, as the government of Germany has done, "hunger organised with the ability of genius." But the people will not put up with hunger. The people will learn, probably very soon, that there is bread, and it can be obtained in no other way than by means that do not show any respect for the sanctity of capital and landownership.

It cannot give freedom, since it is a government of landowners and capitalists, which is afraid of the people.

In another article we will speak of the tactical problems confronting us in our immediate behaviour towards this government. There we shall show wherein consists the peculiarity of the present moment, which is a period of transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second, and why the slogan, the "order of the day" in the *present* moment must be: "Workers, you have displayed marvels of proletarian and popular heroism in the civil war against tsarism; you must display marvels of proletarian and nation-wide organisation in order to prepare your victory in the second stage of the revolution."

Limiting ourselves in the meanwhile to an analysis of the class struggle and the interrelation of class forces in this stage of the revolution, we must also raise the question: Who are the allies of the proletariat in this revolution?

It has two allies: first, the broad mass of the semi-proletarian

and, partly, the petty peasant population of Russia, numbering scores of millions and forming the overwhelming majority of the population. This great mass needs peace, bread, liberty, land. This mass will inevitably be under a certain influence of the bourgeoisie, particularly of the petty bourgeoisie, which it resembles rather closely in its conditions of life, vacillating, as it does, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The cruel lessons of the war, which will become all the more cruel as Guchkov, Lvov, Miliukov and Co. carry on the war with greater energy, will inevitably push this mass toward the proletariat, compelling it to follow the proletariat. We must now, taking advantage of the freedom under the new régime and of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, strive, first of all and above all, to enlighten and organise this mass. Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, Soviets of Agricultural Workers,—these are among our most urgent tasks. We shall thereby strive not only that the agricultural workers should establish special Soviets of their own, but also that the poorest and propertyless peasants should organise separately from the well-to-do peasants. The special tasks and special forms of the organisation urgently needed at present, will be dealt with in another letter.

The second ally of the Russian proletariat is the proletariat of the warring countries and of all countries in general. At present, it is to a considerable degree weighed down by the war, and by the social-chauvinists who, like Plekhanov, Gvozdev, Potresov in Russia, have deserted to the bourgeoisie, but all too often speak in the workers' name. The liberation of the workers from their influence has progressed with every month of the imperialist war, and the Russian Revolution will necessarily accelerate this process tremendously.

Hand in hand with these two allies, the proletariat of Russia can and will proceed, while utilising the peculiarities of the present transition moment, to win, first, a democratic republic and the victory of the peasantry over the landlords, then Socialism, which alone can give peace, bread, and freedom to the peoples exhausted by the war.

N. LENIN.

Written March 20, 1917.

First published in *Pravda* [Truth],²⁴ Nos. 14-15, April 3-4, 1917.

SECOND LETTER

THE NEW GOVERNMENT AND THE PROLETARIAT

THE most important document at my disposal up to date (March 21) is the March 16 issue of the English ultra-conservative and ultra-bourgeois newspaper, *Times*, which contains a summary of the news dealing with the revolution in Russia. A source more favourably—expressing it mildly—inclined to the government of Guchkov and Miliukov, than this paper, would, of course, be difficult to find.

Reporting from Petrograd on Wednesday, March 14, when there was in existence only the *first* Provisional Government, *i. e.*, the Executive Committee of the Duma²⁵ composed of 13 men²⁶ with Rodzianko at their head, and including, as the paper says, two "Socialists," Kerensky and Chkheidze, the *Times* correspondent writes:

"A group of 22 elected members of the Upper House [State Council]²⁷ including M. Guchkov, M. Stakhovich, Prince Trubetskoy, and Professors Vassiliev, Grimm, and Vernadsky, yesterday addressed a telegram to the Tsar," in which they implored him to save "the dynasty," etc., etc., by convoking the Duma and by naming some one who enjoys the "confidence of the nation" to head the government. "What the Emperor may decide to do on his arrival to-day is unknown at the hour of telegraphing, but one thing is quite certain. Unless His Majesty immediately complies with the wishes of the most moderate elements among his loyal subjects, the influence at present exercised by the Provisional Committee of the Imperial Duma will pass wholesale into the hands of the Socialists, who want to see a republic established, but who are unable to institute any kind of orderly government and would inevitably precipitate the country into anarchy within and disaster without."

How statesmanlike, wise, and clear! How well the English sympathiser (if not the leader) of the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs understands the interrelation of class forces and interests! "The most moderate elements among his loyal subjects," *i. e.*, the monarchist landowners and capitalists, want to gain power, because they realise perfectly well that otherwise "influence" will pass into the hands of the "Socialists." Why into the hands of the "Socialists," and not into any other hands? Because the English Guchkovite sees clearly that there is no other social force in the political arena and that there can be none. The revolution was made by the proletariat. The proletariat displayed heroism; it shed its blood; it swept with it the large masses of the toiling and very poor sec-

tions of the population; it demands bread, peace, and freedom; it demands a republic; it sympathises with Socialism. At the same time a handful of landowners and capitalists headed by the Guchkovs and Miliukovs wishes to delude the will and the aspirations of the overwhelming majority; it wishes to make a deal with the disappearing monarchy, to sustain and save it. Appoint Lvov and Guchkov, Your Majesty, and we will support the monarchy against the people. This is the whole meaning and essence of the new government's policy!

But how do they propose to justify this deception, this fooling of the people, this violation of the will of the vast majority of the population?

By using the old and ever new method of the bourgeoisie,—by maligning the people. Thus the English Guchkovite maligns and vilifies, spouts and sputters: "anarchy within and disaster without," no "orderly government"!!

You are wrong, my worthy Guchkovite! The workers want a republic, which is a much more "orderly" government than a monarchy. What assurance have the people that a second Romanov will not establish a second Rasputin? It is the prolongation of the war, it is the new government, that carries with it the threat of disaster. Only a proletarian republic, supported by the village workers and by the poorest section of the urban and rural population, can insure peace, bread, order, and freedom.

These outcries against anarchy are simply meant to cover up the selfish purposes of the capitalists, who are intent on enriching themselves through the war and war loans, who are intent on restoring the monarchy against the interests of the people.

"... Yesterday," continues the correspondent, "the Social-Democratic Party issued a proclamation of a most seditious character, which was spread broadcast throughout the city. They are mere doctrinaires, but their power for mischief is enormous at a time like the present. M. Kerensky and M. Chkheidze, who realise that without the support of the officers and the more moderate elements of the people they cannot hope to avoid anarchy, have to reckon with their less prudent associates, and are insensibly driven to take up an attitude which complicates the task of the Provisional Committee."

Oh, great English Guchkovite diplomat! How "imprudently" you have babbled out the truth!

The "Social-Democratic Party" and the "less prudent associates," with whom Kerensky and Chkheidze are forced "to reckon," are evidently the Central or the Petrograd Committee of our party that

was reconstructed by the conference of January, 1912;²⁸ they are those very "Bolsheviks" whom the bourgeoisie always denounces as "doctrinaires" for being faithful to their "doctrine," i. e., to the tenets, the principles, the teachings, the purposes of *Socialism*. Clearly, the English Guchkovite denounces as seditious and doctrinaire the appeal and conduct of our party because it urges the masses to fight for a republic, for peace, for a complete destruction of the tsarist monarchy, for bread for the people.

Bread for the people and peace, that is sedition; ministerial places for Guchkov and Miliukov, that is "order." Old, familiar talk!

Now what are the tactics of Kerensky and Chkheidze, as characterised by the English Guchkovite?

They are vacillating. On the one hand, the Guchkovite praises them. They, he claims, "realise" (good boys! clever boys!) that without the "support" of the officers and the more moderate elements of the people they cannot hope to avoid anarchy (and here we have been assuming, in accordance with our doctrine, with our Socialist teachings, that it is the capitalists who are forcing anarchy and wars upon human society, and that only the passing of *all* political power into the hands of the proletariat and the poorest elements of the people can rid us of wars, anarchy, hunger!). On the other hand, he complains, they "have to reckon with their less prudent associates," i. e., the Bolsheviks, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, reconstructed and united by the Central Committee.

But what force is it that "drives" Kerensky and Chkheidze to "reckon" with the Bolshevik party, to which they have never belonged, which they themselves or their literary representatives (the Socialists-Revolutionists, the People's Socialists,²⁹ the Mensheviks of the Organisation Committee,³⁰ etc.) have always denounced, condemned, declared to be an insignificant underground group, a sect of doctrinaires, etc.?

When and where was it ever seen that politicians who have not lost their senses should, in times of revolution, in times of action of the *masses*, be swayed by "doctrinaires"?

The poor English Guchkovite got completely lost. Unable to fathom the situation, he could not tell a complete lie nor the whole truth, and succeeded only in betraying himself.

Kerensky and Chkheidze were forced to reckon with the Social-

Democratic Party of the Central Committee³¹ because of the influence it exercises on the proletariat, the masses. Despite the arrest and the exile to Siberia of our Deputies in 1914, despite the severest persecutions and arrests which the Petrograd Committee had suffered throughout the war for its underground activity *against* war and against tsarism, our party was found with the masses, with the revolutionary proletariat.

The English say that facts are stubborn things. May we remind our most worthy English Guchkovite of this saying? The fact that during the great days of the revolution our party was leading or at least bravely helping the Petrograd workers had to be admitted by the English Guchkovite himself. He also had to admit the fact that Kerensky and Chkheidze are vacillating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The followers of Gvozdev, the "defencists," *i. e.*, the social-chauvinists, *i. e.*, the defenders of the imperialist, predatory war, are at the present moment in full agreement with the bourgeoisie. Kerensky, having become a member of the Cabinet, *i. e.*, of the second Provisional Government, has also completely joined the bourgeoisie. Chkheidze has not followed; he is still wavering between the Provisional Government of the bourgeoisie, of the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs, and the "provisional government" of the proletariat and the poorest masses of the people, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies and the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party united by the Central Committee.

It follows, therefore, that the revolution has proved that we were right when we most persistently called upon the workers to realise clearly the class distinction between the major parties and major tendencies both in the labour movement and among the petty-bourgeoisie, when, for instance, we wrote in No. 47 of the Geneva *Social-Democrat*, on October 13, 1915, that is, almost a year and a half ago:

As heretofore we regard as permissible the participation of Social-Democrats in a provisional revolutionary government together with the democratic groups of the petty-bourgeoisie, but *not* together with the revolutionists-chauvinists. We consider as revolutionists-chauvinists those who want a victory over tsarism in order to win a victory over Germany, in order to loot other countries, in order to strengthen the rule of the Great Russians over the other peoples of Russia, etc. The basis for revolutionary chauvinism is the class position of the petty-bourgeoisie, which is always vacillating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. To-day it vacillates between chauvinism (which prevents it from being consistently revolutionary even as regards a democratic republic) and proletarian internationalism. The present political

exponents of the petty-bourgeoisie in Russia are the Trudoviks,³² the Socialists-Revolutionists, the *Nasha Zaria* (the present *Dielo*),³³ Chkheidze's faction, the Organisation Committee, Mr. Plekhanov, etc. If the revolutionists-chauvinists were to win power in Russia, we would be against the defence of their "fatherland" in the present war. Our slogan is—oppose the chauvinists, even if they be revolutionists and republicans, oppose them and demand the union of the international proletariat for a Socialist revolution.

But let us return to the English Guchkovite.

"... The Provisional Committee of the Imperial Duma," he continues, "appreciating the dangers ahead, have purposely refrained from carrying out the original intention of arresting Ministers, although they could have done so yesterday without the slightest difficulty. The door is thus left open for negotiations, thanks to which we" ("we," i. e., English finance capital and imperialism) "may obtain all the benefits of the new régime without passing through the dread ordeal of the Commune and the anarchy of civil war."

The Guchkovites were for civil war for their own benefit; they are against civil war for the people's benefit, i. e., for that of the actual majority of toilers.

"... The relations between the Provisional Committee of the Duma, which represents the whole nation" (this about the committee of the land-owners' and capitalists' Fourth Duma) "and the Council of Workers' Deputies, representing purely class interests" (the language of a diplomat who has heard in passing some learned words and is intent on concealing that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies represents the proletariat and the impoverished masses, i. e., nine-tenths of the population) "but in the crisis like the present wielding enormous power, have aroused no small misgivings among reasonable men regarding the possibility of a conflict between them—the results of which might be too terrible to describe."

"Happily this danger has been averted, at least for the present" (note this "at least"!) "thanks to the influence of Mr. Kerensky, a young lawyer of much oratorical ability, who clearly realises" (in contradistinction to Chkheidze who also "realised" but, in the opinion of the Guchkovite, evidently less clearly?) "the necessity of working with the Committee in the interests of his labour constituency" (i. e., to flirt with labour in order to pull the labour vote). "A satisfactory arrangement³⁴ was concluded to-day" (Wednesday, March 14), "whereby all unnecessary friction will be avoided."

What the arrangement was, whether it was with the *whole* Soviet of Workers' Deputies, what its conditions are, we do not know. The most important thing is now passed over in complete silence by the English Guchkovite. Certainly! It is disadvantageous to the bourgeoisie to make these conditions clear, precise, and public,—for then it may prove more difficult to violate them!

The foregoing lines had already been written when I chanced upon the following very important news. First, the text of the

proclamation issued by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies wherein it promises its "support" to the new government,³⁵ published by the ultra-conservative and ultra-bourgeois Paris newspaper *Temps* (March 20); secondly, excerpts from the speech delivered by Skobelev on March 14 before the Imperial Duma, reprinted in one of the Zurich newspapers (*Neue Züricher Zeitung*, first noon edition, March 21)³⁶ from a report published in a Berlin newspaper (*National-Zeitung*).³⁷

The proclamation issued by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, if the text has not been distorted by the French imperialists, is a most remarkable document. It proves that the Petrograd proletariat, at the time it issued its proclamation, at any rate, was under the preponderant influence of the petty-bourgeois politicians. You will recall that I consider gentlemen of the type of Kerensky and Chkheidze to be politicians of the above-mentioned type.

In the proclamation we find two political ideas and two corresponding slogans:

First, the proclamation states that the government (the new one) consists of "moderate elements." A strange characterisation, utterly inadequate, and of a purely liberal, non-Marxian nature. I, too, am ready to admit that in a certain sense,—just in which sense will be demonstrated in my next letter,—any government at present, i. e., after the completion of the first stage of the revolution, is bound to be "moderate." But under no circumstances must we conceal from ourselves and from the people the fact that this government wishes to prolong the imperialist war, that it is the agent of English capital, that it wants to restore the monarchy, and to strengthen the rule of the landowners and capitalists.

The proclamation declares that every democrat must "support" the new government and that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies requests and authorises Kerensky to participate in the Provisional Government. The conditions are as follows: the promised reforms must be carried out while the war still lasts; freedom of "cultural" (only cultural?) development of nationalities (a purely Cadet and poverty-stricken programme) must be guaranteed; and a special committee for supervising the activities of the Provisional Government, the committee to consist of members of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies and of the "military," must be formed.³⁸

The Supervising Committee, which really embodies the ideas and slogans of second order, we shall separately discuss later.

As for the appointment of Kerensky, the Russian Louis Blanc, and the call to support the new government, these steps are a classic example of betrayal of the cause of the revolution and the cause of the proletariat. It was betrayals of precisely the same kind that destroyed a number of revolutions of the nineteenth century irrespective of how much the adherents of such a policy were sincere and devoted to Socialism.

The proletariat cannot and must not support a war government, a government pledged to restore the monarchy. In order to fight against reaction, to forestall the possible and probable attempts of the Romanovs and their friends to restore the monarchy and to gather a counter-revolutionary army, it is necessary not at all to support Guchkov, but to organise, develop, and strengthen a proletarian militia, to arm the people under the direction of the proletariat. Without this chief, basic, and radical measure, one cannot hope either to offer serious resistance to the restoration of the monarchy and to the attempts at taking away or curtailing the promised liberties, or to take a firm step on the road that leads to bread, peace, and freedom.

If Chkheidze, who together with Kerensky was a member of the first Provisional Government (the Duma Committee of thirteen), has not entered the second Provisional Government because of his loyalty to principles similar to those indicated above, then all honour to him. This should be frankly stated. Unfortunately, such an interpretation contradicts other facts, and most of all it contradicts the speech delivered by Skobelev who has always worked hand in hand with Chkheidze.

If we are to believe the above-named source, Skobelev said that the "social (evidently, Social-Democratic?) group and the workers are quite remote from the aims of the Provisional Government," that the workers demand peace, that, if the war is continued, disaster in the spring is inevitable, that "the workers have entered into a temporary truce (*eine vorläufige Waffenfreundschaft*) with society (liberal society), although their political aims are as remote from those of society as heaven is from earth," and that the "liberals must renounce their senseless (*unsinnige*) war aims," etc.

This speech is a sample of what we designated above, in our quotation from the *Social-Democrat*, as "vacillation" between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Liberals, as long as they remain liberals, cannot "renounce" the "senseless" war aims, particularly

since these war aims are not determined by the liberals alone, but by Anglo-French finance capital, a world power measured by hundreds of billions. It is not the liberals whom one must "persuade," but it is the workers to whom one must explain why the liberals are perplexed, why they are bound hand and foot, why they conceal both the treaties concluded between tsarism and England, etc., and the arrangements made between Russian and Anglo-French capital, etc., etc.

When Skobelev tells us that the workers have entered into some kind of an agreement with the liberal groups, and does not protest against it, and does not explain to the workers, from the Duma tribune, its harmfulness to them, he thereby approves of this agreement, and this should not have been done.

Skobelev's direct or indirect, expressed or tacit, approval of the agreement entered into by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies with the Provisional Government, is a swing to the side of the bourgeoisie. Skobelev's statement that the workers demand peace, that their aims are as remote from those of the liberals as heaven is from earth, is a swing to the side of the proletariat.

Purely proletarian, truly revolutionary, thoroughly sound in its conception is the second political idea of the proclamation of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies now under our consideration, namely, the idea of creating a "Supervising Committee" (I do not know whether this is the correct name in Russian, it is a free translation from the French), namely, the idea of proletarian and soldier supervision over the actions of the Provisional Government.

That's the thing! This is worthy of workers who have shed their blood for freedom, for peace, and for bread for the people! This is a real step leading toward real guarantees against tsarism, against monarchy, as well as against the monarchists Guchkov, Lvov and Co.! This is a sign that the Russian proletariat, regardless of everything, has gone ahead in comparison with the French proletariat of 1848, which had "invested" Louis Blanc with full power! This is proof that the instinct and the intelligence of the proletarian masses are not satisfied with declamations, exclamations, promises of reforms and liberties, are not satisfied with having a "Minister authorised by the workers," or with like tinsel show, but that they seek support where support really is,—in the armed masses of the population organised and led by the proletariat, the class-conscious workers.

This is a step along the right track, but only the first step.

If the "Supervising Committee" remains a purely parliamentary institution, of a purely political nature, *i.e.*, if it remains a commission that will "interrogate" the Provisional Government and receive answers from it, then it is nothing but a toy, then it does not amount to anything.

If, however, it leads toward the creation, immediately and unfailingly, of a really popular, really proletarian militia or workers' armed force, composed of men and women, who will not merely take the place of the police that has been removed and killed off, but render impossible the restoration of such a police by any monarchial-constitutional or democratic-republican government, either in Petrograd or anywhere else in Russia,—then the advanced Russian workers are actually moving toward new and great victories, toward putting an end to the war, toward the actual realisation of the slogan, which, according to the newspapers, was displayed on the banners of the cavalry regiments in Petrograd when they were demonstrating on the square in front of the Imperial Duma:

"Long Live the Socialist Republics of All Countries!"

My ideas concerning this proletarian militia will be presented in the next letter.

In it I shall try to show, on the one hand, that the creation of a popular militia under the leadership of the workers is the correct slogan of the day, meeting the tactical requirements of the unique transition period which the Russian Revolution (and the world revolution) is now going through; on the other hand, that in order to insure the success of such a workers' militia, it must, first, be a national, a universal mass militia, embracing the entire able-bodied population of both sexes; second, it must proceed to combine not only police functions pure and simple, but also general governmental functions with military ones, and with control over social production and distribution of products.

N. LENIN.

Zürich, March 22, 1917.

P.S. I forgot to date the preceding letter as of March 20, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

THIRD LETTER

ON PROLETARIAN MILITIA

THE conclusion which I drew yesterday regarding the vacillating tactics of Chkheidze has been fully confirmed to-day, March 23, by two documents. The first is a despatch from Stockholm to the *Frankfurter Zeitung*³⁹ quoting from the manifesto of the Central Committee of our party, the R.S.-D.L.P., in Petrograd.⁴⁰ This document contains not a word about either the support of the Guchkov government or its overthrow: the workers and the soldiers are called upon to organise around the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, to elect representatives to the Soviet in order to fight against tsarism, for a republic, for an eight-hour working day, for the confiscation of landowners' lands and grain reserves, and chiefly for the termination of the plunderers' war. Particularly important and particularly timely is the very correct idea of our C.C. that to obtain peace, relations must be established among the *proletarians of all the warring countries*.

To hope for peace from the negotiations and communications of the bourgeois governments would be self-deception as well as deception of the people.

The second document is another despatch from Stockholm to another German paper (*Vossische Zeitung*)⁴¹ reporting a joint conference of the Chkheidze Duma fraction, the Trudoviks (*Arbeiterfraktion?*) and the representatives of fifteen labour unions held on March 15, and telling of the proclamation issued on the following day. Of the eleven points in this proclamation, the telegram quotes only three: the first, demanding a republic; the seventh, demanding peace and the immediate beginning of peace negotiations; and the third, demanding "an adequate representation of the Russian working class in the government."

If this last point is quoted correctly, then I understand why the bourgeoisie lauds Chkheidze, I understand why to the praise by the English Guchkovites in the *Times*, which I quoted above, there has now been added the praise by the French Guchkovites in the *Temps*. This organ of French millionaires and imperialists writes on March 22: "The leaders of the workers' parties, and especially Mr. Chkheidze, exert all their influence to temper the demands of the working classes."

Indeed, the demand for workers' "participation" in the Guchkov-Miliukov government is a theoretical and political absurdity; to participate as a minority would mean to be a pawn; to participate "on equal terms" is impossible, for one cannot reconcile the demand to continue the war with the demand to conclude an armistice and open peace negotiations; to "participate" as a majority, one must have power to overthrow the Guchkov-Miliukov government. In practice, to demand "participation" is to pursue the worst kind of Louis Blancism, *i.e.*, to forget the class struggle and its actual conditions, to be allured by empty, high-sounding phrases, to spread illusions among the workers, to waste, in negotiations with Miliukov and Kerensky, precious time which should be used for creating an actual class force, a revolutionary force, a proletarian militia capable of inspiring confidence in all the poorest strata of the population which are an overwhelming majority, and of helping them to organise, helping them to fight for bread, for peace, and for freedom.

This error in the proclamation of Chkheidze and his group (I do not speak of the party of the O.C., the Organisation Committee, for in the sources at my disposal there is no mention of the O.C.)—this error seems the more strange when we consider that at the conference of March 15, Skobelev, Chkheidze's closest ideological ally, said, according to the newspapers: "Russia is on the eve of a second, a real (*wirklichen*) revolution."

Now this is a truth from which Skobelev and Chkheidze have failed to make any practical deductions. I cannot judge from here, my accursed exile, how near the second revolution is. Skobelev, who is there on the spot, can see it better. I therefore do not occupy myself with questions for the answer to which I have no concrete data and can have none. I simply emphasise the fact that a "stranger," *i.e.*, one who does not belong to our party, Skobelev, confirms the *very* conclusion that I arrived at in the first letter, namely: that the March revolution was only the *first stage* of the revolution. Russia is going through a unique historical period of *transition* from the first to the next stage of the revolution or, as Skobelev expresses it, to "a second revolution."

If we want to be Marxists and to learn from the experience of the revolutions the world over, we must try to understand just wherein lies the *uniqueness* of this transition period, and what are the tactics that follow from its objective peculiarities.

The uniqueness of the situation lies in the fact that the Guchkov-Miliukov government has won the first victory with unusual ease because of the three following main circumstances: 1. The help received from Anglo-French finance capital and its agents; 2. The help received from the upper layers of the army; 3. The fact that the entire Russian bourgeoisie had been organised in zemstvo and city institutions, in the Imperial Duma, in the war industries committees, etc.

The Guchkov government finds itself between the upper and nether millstones. Bound by capitalist interests, it is compelled to strive to prolong the predatory war for plunder, to protect the monstrous profits of the capitalists and the landlords, to restore the monarchy. Bound by its revolutionary origin and the necessity of an abrupt change from tsarism to democracy, finding itself under the pressure of the hungry masses that clamour for peace, the government is forced to lie, to shift about, to procrastinate, to make as many "declarations" and promises as possible (promises are the only things that are very cheap even in an epoch of insanely high prices), and to carry out as few of them as possible, to make concessions with one hand, and to withdraw them with the other.

Under certain conditions, if circumstances are most favourable to it, the new government, relying on the organising abilities of the entire Russian bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia, may temporarily avert the final crash. But even under such conditions it cannot escape the crash altogether, for it is *impossible* to escape the claws of that terrible monster, begotten by world-capitalism—the imperialist war and famine,—without abandoning the whole basis of bourgeois relations, without resorting to revolutionary measures, without appealing to the greatest historical heroism of the Russian and the world proletariat.

Hence the conclusion: We shall not be able to overthrow the new government with one stroke or, should we be able to do so (in revolutionary times the limits of the possible are increased a thousandfold), we could not retain power, *unless we met* the splendid organisation of the entire Russian bourgeoisie and the entire bourgeois intelligentsia with an *organisation of the proletariat* just as splendid, leading the vast mass of the city and country poor, the semi-proletarians and the petty proprietors.

It matters little whether the "second revolution" has already broken out in Petrograd (I have stated that it would be absurd to

attempt to estimate from abroad the actual tempo of its growth), whether it has been postponed for a time, or whether it has begun in isolated localities in Russia (there are some indications that this is the case)—*in any case* the slogan of the hour right now, on the eve of the revolution, during the revolution, and on the day after the revolution, must be—*proletarian organisation*.

Comrade-workers! Yesterday you displayed wonders of proletarian heroism when you overthrew the tsarist monarchy. Sooner or later (perhaps even now, while I am writing these lines) you will inevitably be called upon again to display wonders of similar heroism in overthrowing the power of the landowners and the capitalists who are waging the imperialist war. But you will not be able to win a *permanent victory* in this forthcoming “true” revolution, unless you display *wonders of proletarian organisation!*

The slogan of the hour is organisation. But organisation in itself does not mean much, because, on the one hand, organisation is always necessary, and, hence, the mere insistence on “the organisation of the masses” does not yet clarify anything, and because, on the other hand, he who contents himself with organisation only is merely echoing the views of the liberals; for the liberals, to strengthen their rule, desire nothing better than to have the workers refuse to go *beyond the usual “legal” forms of organisation* (from the point of view of “normal” bourgeois society), *i. e.*, to have them *merely* become members of their party, their trade union, their co-operative society, etc., etc.

The workers, guided by their class instinct, have realised that in revolutionary times they need an entirely different organisation, of a type above the ordinary. They have taken the right attitude suggested by the experience of our revolution of 1905 and by the Paris Commune of 1871: they have created a *Soviet of Workers’ Deputies*, they have set out to develop it, widen and strengthen it, by attracting to it representatives of the soldiers and no doubt of the hired agricultural workers, as well as (in one form or another) of the entire poor section of the peasantry.

To create similar organisations in all the localities of Russia without exception, for all the trades and layers of the proletarian and semi-proletarian population without exception, *i. e.*, for all the toilers and the exploited (to use an expression that is less exact from the point of view of economics but more popular), is our most important and most urgent task. I will note right here that to the

peasant masses our party (whose specific rôle in the proletarian organisations of the new type I shall have occasion to discuss in one of the forthcoming letters) must recommend with special emphasis the organisation of Soviets of hired workers and petty agriculturists, such as do not sell their grain, those Soviets *to have no connection* with the prosperous peasants,—otherwise it will be impossible to pursue a true proletarian policy, in a general sense,* nor will it be possible correctly to approach the most important practical question involving the life and death of millions of people, *i. e.*, the question of an equitable assessment of food deliveries, of increasing its production, etc.

The question, then, is: What is to be the work of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies? We repeat what we once said in No. 47 of the Geneva *Social-Democrat* (October 13, 1915): "They must be regarded as organs of insurrection, as organs of revolutionary power."

This theoretical formula, derived from the experience of the Commune of 1871 and of the Russian Revolution of 1905, must be elucidated and concretely developed on the basis of the practical experience gained at this very stage of this very revolution in Russia.

We need revolutionary *power*, we need (for a certain period of transition) the *state*. Therein we differ from the Anarchists. The difference between revolutionary Marxists and Anarchists lies not only in the fact that the former stand for huge, centralised, communist production, while the latter are for decentralised, small-scale production. No, the difference as to government authority and the state consists in this, that we stand *for* the revolutionary utilisation of revolutionary forms of the state in our struggle for Socialism, while the Anarchists are *against* it.

We need the state. But we need none of those types of state varying from a constitutional monarchy to the most democratic republic which the bourgeoisie has established everywhere. And herein lies the difference between us and the opportunists and Kautskians of the old, decaying Socialist parties who have distorted or

* There will now develop in the village a struggle for the petty, and partly the middle, peasantry. The landowners, basing themselves on the well-to-do peasants, will lead them to submission to the bourgeoisie. We, basing ourselves on the hired agricultural workers and poor peasants, must lead them to the closest possible alliance with the proletariat of the cities.

forgotten the lessons of the Paris Commune and the analysis of these lessons by Marx and Engels.*

We need the state, but not the kind needed by the bourgeoisie, with organs of power in the form of police, army, bureaucracy, distinct from and opposed to the people. All bourgeois revolutions have merely perfected this government apparatus, have merely transferred it from one party to another.

The proletariat, however, if it wants to preserve the gains of the present revolution and to proceed further to win peace, bread, and freedom, must "destroy," to use Marx's word, this "ready-made" state machinery, and must replace it by another one, *merging* the police, the army, and the bureaucracy *with the universally armed people*. Advancing along the road indicated by the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Russian Revolution of 1905, the proletariat must organise and arm *all* the poorest and most exploited sections of the population, so that they *themselves* may take into their own hands all the organs of state power, that they *themselves* may constitute these organs.

The workers of Russia have already, with the very first stage of the first revolution, March, 1917, *entered* on this course. The whole problem now is to understand clearly the nature of this new course and courageously, firmly, and persistently, to continue on it.

The Anglo-French and the Russian capitalists wanted "only" to displace, or merely to "scare," Nicholas II, leaving the old machinery of the state—the police, the army, the bureaucracy—intact.

The workers have gone further; they have smashed it. And now not only the Anglo-French, but even the German capitalists howl with rage and horror when they see Russian soldiers shooting their officers, some of whom were even supporters of Guchkov and Miliukov, as Admiral Nepenin, for example.

I have said that the workers have smashed the old state machinery. To be more precise: They *have begun* to smash it.

Let us take a concrete example.

The police of Petrograd and many other places have been partly killed off, and partly removed. The Guchkov-Miliukov government

* In one of the forthcoming letters or in a special article I shall dwell in detail on this analysis as given particularly in Marx's *Civil War in France*, in Engels' preface to the third edition of that work, in Marx's letter dated April 12, 1871, and in Engel's letters of March 18-28, 1875, also on the complete distortion of Marxism by Kautsky in his 1912 polemics against Pannekoek relative to the so-called "destruction of the state."

will not be able to restore the monarchy, nor even to retain power, unless it re-establishes the police as an organisation of armed men separated from and opposed to the people and under the command of the bourgeoisie. This is as clear as the clearest day.

On the other hand, the new government must reckon with the revolutionary masses, must humour them with half-concessions and promises, trying to gain time. Hence it agrees to half-measures: it institutes a "people's militia" with elected officers (this sounds terribly imposing, terribly democratic, revolutionary, and beautiful!). But . . . but . . . first of all, it places the militia under the control of the local zemstvo and city organs of self-government, *i. e.*, under the control of landowners and capitalists elected under the laws of Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman!! Secondly, though it calls it the "people's" militia to throw dust into the eyes of the "people," it does not, as a matter of fact call the people for *universal* service in this militia, nor does it compel the bosses and the capitalists to *pay* their employees the usual wage for the hours and the days they devote to public service, *i. e.*, to the militia.

There is where the main trick is. That is how the landowner and capitalist government of the Guchkovs and Miliukovs achieves its aim of keeping the "people's militia" on paper, while in reality it is quietly and step by step organising a bourgeois militia hostile to the people, first of "8,000 students and professors" (as the foreign press describes the present militia in Petrograd)—which is obviously a mere toy!—then, gradually, of the old and the new police.

Do not permit the re-establishment of the police! Do not let go the local government organs! Create a really universal militia, led by the proletariat! This is the task of the day, this is the slogan of the present hour, equally in accord with the correctly understood requirements of the further development of the class struggle, the further course of the revolution, and with the democratic instinct of every worker, every peasant, every toiler, every one who is exploited, who cannot but hate the police, the constables, the command of landowners and capitalists over armed men who wield power over the people.

What kind of police do *they* need, these Guchkovs and Miliukovs, these landowners and capitalists? The same kind that existed during the tsarist monarchy. Following very brief revolutionary periods, *all* the bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic republics of

the world organised or re-established precisely that kind of police,—a special organisation of armed men, separated from and opposed to the people, and in one way or another subordinated to the bourgeoisie.

What kind of militia do we need, we, the proletariat, all the toilers? A real people's militia, *i. e.*, first of all, one that consists of the entire population, of all the adult citizens of both sexes; secondly, one that combines the functions of a people's army with those of the police, and with the functions of the main and fundamental organ of the state system and the state administration.

To give more concreteness to these propositions, let us try a schematic example. Needless to say, the idea of laying out any "plan" for a proletarian militia would be absurd: when the workers, and all the people as a real mass, take up this task in a practical way, they will work it out and secure it a hundred times better than any theoretician can propose. I am not offering a plan—all I want is to illustrate my thought.

Petrograd has a population of about two million, more than half of which is between the ages of 15 and 65. Let us take a half—one million. Let us deduct one-fourth to allow for the sick or other instances where people cannot be engaged in public service for a valid reason. There still remain 750,000 persons, who, working in the militia one day out of every fifteen (and continuing to receive payment from their employers for this time), would make up an army of 50,000 people.

This is the type of "state" that we need!

This is the kind of militia that would be, in deed, and not only in name, a "people's militia."

This is the road we must follow if we wish to make impossible the re-establishment of a special police, or a special army, separated from the people.

Such a militia would, in ninety-five cases out of a hundred, be composed of workers and peasants, and would express the real intelligence and the will, the strength and the authority of the overwhelming majority of the people. Such a militia would actually arm and give military training to the people at large, thus making sure, in a manner not employed by Guchkov, nor Miliukov, against all attempts to re-establish reaction, against all efforts of the tsarist agents. Such a militia would be the executive organ of the "Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies," it would enjoy the *full* respect

and confidence of the population, because it would, itself, be an organisation of the entire population. Such a militia would change democracy from a pretty signboard, hiding the enslavement and deception of the people by the capitalists, into a real means for *educating the masses* so that they might be able to take part in *all* the affairs of the state. Such a militia would draw the youngsters into political life, training them not only by word, but by deed and *work*. Such a militia would develop those functions which belong, to use learned terms, to the welfare police, sanitary supervision, etc., by drawing into such activities all the adult women without exception. Without drawing the women into social service, into the militia, into political life, without tearing the women away from the stupefying domestic and kitchen atmosphere it is impossible to secure real freedom, it is impossible to build a democracy, let alone Socialism.

Such a militia would be a proletarian militia, because the industrial and the city workers would just as naturally and inevitably assume in it the leadership of the masses of the poor, as naturally and inevitably as they took the leading position in all the revolutionary struggles of the people in the years 1905-1907, and in 1917.

Such a militia would guarantee absolute order and a comradely discipline practiced with enthusiasm. At the same time, it would afford a means of struggling in a real democratic manner against the crisis through which all the warring nations are now passing; it would make possible the regular and prompt assessment of food and other supply levies, the establishment of "universal labour duty" which the French now call "civil mobilisation" and the Germans—"obligatory civil service," and without which, as has been demonstrated, it is impossible to heal the wounds that were and are being inflicted by this predatory and horrible war.

Has the proletariat of Russia shed its blood only to receive luxurious promises of mere political democratic reforms? Will it not demand and make sure that every toiler should see and feel a certain improvement in his life right now? That every family should have sufficient bread? That every child should have a bottle of good milk, and that no adult in a rich family should dare take extra milk until all the children are supplied? That the palaces and luxurious homes left by the Tsar and the aristocracy should not stand idle but should provide shelter to the homeless and the

destitute? What other organisation except a universal people's militia with women participating on a par with the men can effect these measures?

Such measures *do not yet* constitute Socialism. They deal with distribution of consumption, not with the reorganisation of industry. They do not yet constitute the "dictatorship of the proletariat," but merely a "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry." Theoretical classification doesn't matter now. It would indeed be a grave error if we tried now to fit the complex, urgent, rapidly unfolding practical tasks of the revolution into the Procrustean bed of a narrowly conceived "theory," instead of regarding theory first of all and above all as a *guide to action*.

Will the mass of Russian workers have sufficient class-consciousness, self-discipline and heroism to show "wonders of proletarian organisation" after they have displayed wonders of courage, initiative and self-sacrifice in direct revolutionary struggle? This we do not know, and to make conjectures about it would be idle, for such questions are answered *only* by life itself.

What we do know definitely and what we must as a party explain to the masses is that we have on hand an historic motive power of tremendous force that causes an unheard-of crisis, hunger and countless miseries. This motive power is the war which the capitalists of *both* warring camps are waging for predatory purposes. This "motive power" has brought a number of the richest, freest, and most enlightened nations to the brink of an abyss. It *forces* nations to strain all their strength to the breaking point, it places them in an insufferable position, it makes imperative the putting into effect not of "theories" (that is out of the question, and Marx had repeatedly warned Socialists against this illusion), but of most extreme yet practical measures, because *without* these extreme measures there is death, immediate and indubitable death for millions of people through hunger.

That revolutionary enthusiasm on the part of the most advanced class can accomplish much when objective conditions demand extreme measures from the entire people, need not be argued. *This aspect of the case is clearly seen and felt by every one in Russia.*

It is important to understand that in revolutionary times the objective situation changes as rapidly and as suddenly as life itself. We should be able to adjust our tactics and our immediate objec-

tives to the peculiarities of every given situation. Up to March, 1917, our task was to conduct a bold revolutionary-internationalist propaganda, to awaken and call the masses to struggle. In the March days there was required the courage of heroic struggle to crush tsarism—the most immediate foe. We are now going through a transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second, from a “grapple” with tsarism to a “grapple” with the imperialism of Guchkov-Miliukov, of the capitalists and the landowners. Our immediate problem is organisation, not in the sense of effecting ordinary organisation by ordinary methods, but in the sense of drawing large masses of the oppressed classes in unheard-of numbers into the organisation, and of embodying in this organisation military, state, and national economic problems.

The proletariat has approached this unique task and will approach it in a variety of ways. In some localities of Russia the March revolution has given the proletariat almost full power,—in others, the proletariat will begin to build up and strengthen the proletarian militia perhaps by “usurpation”;—in still others, it will, probably, work for immediate elections, on the basis of universal suffrage, to the city councils and zemstvos, in order to turn them into revolutionary centres, etc., until the growth of proletarian organisation, the rapprochement of soldiers and workers, the stirring within the peasantry, the disillusionment of very many about the competence of the militarist-imperialist government of Guchkov and Miliukov shall have brought nearer the hour when that government will give place to the “government” of the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies.

Nor must we forget that right near Petrograd there is one of the most advanced, actually republican, countries—Finland,—a country which from 1905 up to 1917, shielded by the revolutionary struggles in Russia, has developed a democracy by comparatively peaceful means, and has won the majority of its population over to Socialism. The Russian proletariat will insure the freedom of the Finnish republic, even to the point of separation (there is hardly a Social-Democrat who would hesitate on this score now, when the Cadet Rodichev is so shamefully haggling in Helsingfors over bits of privileges for the Great Russians), and thus gain the full confidence and comradely aid of the Finnish workers for the all-Russian proletarian cause. In a difficult and great cause errors are unavoidable, nor shall we avoid them; the Finnish workers are better organisers,

they will help us in this and, *in their own way*, bring nearer the establishment of a Socialist republic.

Revolutionary victories in Russia itself,—quiet organisational successes in Finland shielded by the above victories,—the Russian workers taking up revolutionary-organisational tasks on a new scale,—conquest of power by the proletariat and the poorest strata of the population,—encouraging and developing the Socialist revolution in the West,—this is the path that will lead us to peace and Socialism.

N. LENIN.

Zürich, March 24, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

FOURTH LETTER

HOW TO GET PEACE

I HAVE just read (March 25) the following despatch sent to the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (No. 517, March 24) from Berlin:

"It is reported from Sweden that Maxim Gorki has sent both to the government, and to the Executive Committee [of the Soviet] an enthusiastically written greeting. He hails the victory of the people over the masters of reaction and calls upon all sons of Russia to help build the new Russian state edifice. At the same time he calls upon the government to crown its work of liberation with the conclusion of peace. It must not be peace at any price, he says; at the present moment Russia has less cause to strive for peace at any price than she has had at any other time. It must be a peace, he says, that would enable Russia to live honourably before the eyes of all the other peoples of the earth. Humanity has bled enough; the new government would perform the greatest service to Russia as well as to the rest of humanity, if it succeeded in bringing about an early peace."

Thus reads the report of Gorki's letter.

One feels embittered on reading this letter which is permeated with ordinary philistine prejudices. The present writer on many occasions, in meetings with Gorki on the Island of Capri, warned him and reproached him for his political errors. Gorki parried these reproaches with his inimitably sweet smile and the candid admission: "I know that I am a bad Marxist. Moreover, all of us,

artists, are a bit irresponsible." It is not easy to argue against that.

Gorki has, no doubt, great artistic talent that has been and will be of great use to the proletarian movement of the world.

But why should Gorki dabble in politics?

In my opinion Gorki's letter voices preconceived ideas that are exceedingly widespread not only among the petty bourgeoisie, but also among a section of the workers under the influence of that bourgeoisie. The entire strength of our party, every effort of the class-conscious workers, must be directed toward a stubborn, persistent, and many-sided fight against these false ideas.

The tsarist government began and waged the present war as a predatory, imperialist war for spoliation, to rob and crush the weak nations. The government of the Guchkovs and Miliukovs, which is a landowners' and capitalists' government, is forced to continue and wants to continue the very same kind of a war. To come to that government with the suggestion that it should conclude a democratic peace is equivalent to approaching proprietors of houses of ill fame with a sermon on virtue.

Let us explain what we mean.

What is imperialism?

In my pamphlet, *Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, which, before the revolution, had been submitted to the publishing firm "Parus," [Sail], accepted by it and announced in the magazine *Lietopis*⁴² [Annals], I answered this question in the following way:

"Imperialism is capitalism in that phase of its development in which the domination of monopolies and finance capital has established itself; in which the export of capital has acquired very great importance; in which the division of the world among international trusts has begun; in which the partition of all the territories of the earth among the greatest capitalist countries has been completed." (Chapter VII of the above-named pamphlet, announced in the *Lietopis*, when there was still a censorship, under the title: V. Ilyin,* *Recent Capitalism.*)⁴³

The whole thing reduces itself to the fact that capital has grown to enormous dimensions. Associations of a small number of the greatest capitalists (cartels, syndicates, trusts) manipulate billions and divide the whole world among themselves. The earth has

* One of Lenin's *noms de plume*.—Ed.

been completely divided. The war has been brought on by the clash of two mighty groups of billionaires, the Anglo-French and the German, over the redivision of the world.

The Anglo-French group of capitalists wishes first of all to rob Germany by taking away its colonies (almost all of them have already been taken away)—then to rob Turkey.

The German group of capitalists wishes to grab Turkey for itself and to compensate itself for the loss of the colonies by seizing the neighbouring small states (Belgium, Serbia, Rumania).

This is the real truth, concealed under various bourgeois lies such as “war for liberation,” “national” war, a “war for right and justice” and similar toy-rattles with which the capitalists always fool the common people.

Russia is fighting this war not with its own money. Russian capital is the partner of Anglo-French capital. Russia is fighting this war in order that it may rob Armenia, Turkey, Galicia.

Guchkov, Lvov, Miliukov, our present Ministers, are not leaders by accident. They are the representatives and leaders of the entire class of landowners and capitalists. They are bound by the interests of capital. Capitalists are as incapable of sacrificing their interests as man is incapable of lifting himself by his own bootstraps.

Secondly, Guchkov, Miliukov and Co. are bound by Anglo-French capital. They have been and still are conducting the war on borrowed money. They have promised to pay on the borrowed billions interest amounting to hundreds of millions yearly, to squeeze this tribute out of the Russian workers and the Russian peasants.

Thirdly, Guchkov, Miliukov and Co. are bound to England, France, Italy, Japan, and other groups of capitalist-robbers by direct treaties dealing with the predatory aims of the war. These treaties were concluded by Tsar Nicholas II. Guchkov, Miliukov and Co., taking advantage of the struggle of the workers against the tsarist monarchy, seized power, but they have confirmed the treaties concluded by the Tsar.

This was done by the entire Guchkov-Miliukov government in a Manifesto which the Petrograd Telegraph Agency reported abroad on March 20: “The government” (of Guchkov and Miliukov), says the Manifesto, “aims to live up faithfully to all its treaty obligations to other countries.” The new Minister of Foreign Affairs, Miliukov, made a similar declaration in his telegram to all the representatives of Russia abroad (March 18, 1917).⁴⁴

These treaties are all secret, and Miliukov and Co. do not wish to publish them for two reasons: (1) They are afraid of the people, which does not want any predatory war. (2) They are bound by Anglo-French capital, which demands that the treaties remain secret. But any one who has read newspapers and who has studied the subject knows that these treaties deal with the looting of China by Japan; of Persia, Armenia, Turkey (Constantinople in particular), and Galicia, by Russia; of Albania, by Italy; of Turkey, the German colonies, etc., by France and England.

That is how things stand.

That is why there is just as much sense in asking the Guchkov-Miliukov government speedily to conclude an honest, democratic, neighbourly peace as there is in the appeal of the kindly village priest to the landlords and merchants to live a godly life, to love their neighbours, and to turn the right cheek when one strikes them on the left. The landowners and the merchants listen to the sermon, continue to oppress and rob the people and extol the priest's ability to console and pacify the peasants.

Precisely the same rôle—whether they realise it or not—is played by all those who in the present imperialist war come to the bourgeois governments with kindly proposals of peace. The bourgeois governments at times refuse to listen to such proposals and even prohibit them altogether, but sometimes countenance them and issue assurances right and left that what they are really fighting for is the speedy conclusion of a “most righteous” peace, and that the only one at fault is the enemy. All such proposals of peace and appeals to bourgeois governments turn out in fact to be a hoax upon the people.

The groups of capitalists who have drenched the earth in blood over the partition of territories, markets, and concessions, cannot conclude an “honourable” peace. They can conclude only a dishonourable peace, a peace based on the division of spoils, on the partition of Turkey and the colonies.

Moreover, the Guchkov-Miliukov government is altogether opposed to peace at the present moment, for now its share of the spoils would include only Armenia and a part of Galicia, whereas its real aim is to seize Constantinople, and to regain from the Germans Poland, a country that was always inhumanly and disgracefully oppressed by tsarism. Furthermore, the Guchkov-Miliukov government is essentially the errand boy of Anglo-French

capital that wants to retain the colonies wrested from Germany and also to compel Germany to hand back Belgium and a part of France. Anglo-French capital has helped the Guchkovs and Miliukovs to remove Nicholas II, in order that the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs might help it to "vanquish" Germany.

What then is to be done?

In order to obtain peace (and particularly, to obtain a really democratic, a really honourable peace), it is necessary that the power of the state should be in the hands not of the landlords and the capitalists, but in the hands of the workers and the poorest peasants. The landlords and the capitalists constitute an insignificant minority of the population; the capitalists, as every one knows, are making enormous profits out of the war.

The workers and the poorest peasants constitute an overwhelming majority of the population. Far from enriching themselves out of the war, they are actually being ruined and starved. They are bound neither by capital nor by treaties with predatory capitalist gangs; they are in a position and sincerely wish to bring the war to an end.

Were the state power in Russia to belong to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, these Soviets and the All-Russian Soviet elected by them could and certainly would agree to put into effect the peace programme which our party (Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party) had outlined as far back as October 13, 1915, and printed in No. 47 of *Social-Democrat*, the Central Organ of our party (published then in Geneva on account of the oppressive tsarist censorship).

This peace programme would probably be as follows:

1. The All-Russian Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies (or the Petrograd Soviet which temporarily takes its place) would immediately declare that it was not bound by any treaties concluded either by the tsarist monarchy or by the bourgeois governments.

2. It would forthwith publish all these treaties in order to expose to public obloquy the predatory aims of the tsarist monarchy and of all bourgeois governments, without exception.

3. It would immediately and openly propose to all the warring nations that an armistice be concluded forthwith.

4. It would immediately publish, so that every one might know, our, the workers' and the peasants', conditions for peace: the libera-

tion of all colonies; the liberation of all dependent, oppressed, and non-sovereign peoples.

5. It would declare that it expected no good to come from the bourgeois governments and that it proposed to the workers of all the countries to overthrow them and to transfer all the state power to Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

6. It would declare that the billion-ruble debts contracted by the bourgeois governments for the purpose of carrying on this criminal and predatory war should be paid by the capitalists themselves, and that the workers and peasants refused to recognise these debts. To pay interest on these debts would mean to pay tribute to the capitalists for many, many years for having generously permitted the workers to kill one another over the division of spoils by the capitalists.

The Soviet of Workers' Deputies would say: Workers and peasants! Are you willing to pay hundreds of millions of rubles yearly to compensate the capitalists for a war that has been waged for the purpose of partitioning the African colonies, Turkey, etc.?

For the enforcement of such conditions of peace the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, in my opinion, would agree to wage war against any bourgeois government and against all bourgeois governments of the world, because a war in that case would be a really just war and all the workers and toilers of all countries would work for its success.

The German worker sees now that the militarist monarchy in Russia is being replaced by a militarist republic, a republic of capitalists who wish to continue the imperialist war, who sanction the predatory treaties of the tsarist monarchy.

Judge for yourselves, can the German worker trust such a republic?

Judge for yourselves, can the war continue, can the domination of capitalists in the world continue, if the Russian people, always sustained by the living memories of the great revolution of 1905, wins complete freedom and places the entire state power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies?

Zürich, March 25, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

FIFTH LETTER

PROBLEMS OF REVOLUTIONARY PROLETARIAN ORGANISATION
OF THE STATE

IN the foregoing letters the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat of Russia have been outlined as follows: (1) To find the surest road leading to the next stage of the revolution or to the second revolution, which revolution (2) shall transfer the state power from the government of landowners and capitalists (the Guchkovs, Lvovs, Miliukovs, Kerenskys) to a government of the workers and poorest peasants. (3) The latter government must be organised on the model of the Soviet of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, namely (4), it must shatter and completely eliminate the old government apparatus prevailing in all the bourgeois countries, the army, the police, the bureaucracy, putting in its place (5) not only a mass organisation but an organisation of a universally armed people. (6) Only such a government, with "such" a class composition (revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry) and such administrative organs (proletarian militia) will be able to solve successfully the exceedingly difficult, urgent, and most important problem of the moment, *i. e.*, the problem of obtaining peace, not an imperialist peace, not agreements among imperialist governments concerning the division of spoils by the capitalists and their governments, but a true, permanent, democratic peace which cannot be attained without a proletarian revolution in a number of countries. (7) In Russia the victory of the proletariat can be accomplished in the nearest future only if the workers are at the very outset supported by an overwhelming majority of the peasantry in its fight for the confiscation of all the lands owned by the landowners, and for the nationalisation of the entire land, if we assume that the agrarian programme of the "104"⁴⁵ is still essentially the agrarian programme of the peasantry. (8) In connection with and on the basis of such a peasant revolution further steps of the proletariat in union with the poorest section of the peasantry are possible and necessary, steps directed towards the control of industry and the distribution of basic products, towards the establishment of "universal labour duty," etc. These steps are absolutely and imperatively demanded by the conditions created by the war, conditions which are likely to become

even more aggravated in post-war times; in their entirety and in their development, these steps would represent the *transition to Socialism*, which in Russia cannot be realised immediately, directly, without transition measures, which, however, is perfectly realisable and urgently needed as a result of such transition measures. (9) The task of immediately organising in the villages separate Soviets of Workers' Deputies, *i. e.*, Soviets of hired agricultural workers, distinct from the Soviets of the rest of the peasant deputies, appears to be most urgent.

This, in short, is the programme we outlined, after taking stock of the class forces of the Russian and the world revolutions, as well as of the experience of 1871 and 1905.

Let us now attempt a general view of this programme as a whole, considering at the same time the manner in which it was approached by K. Kautsky, the greatest theoretician of the "Second" International (1889-1914) and the most conspicuous representative of the "centre" or the "swamp" group observable in all the countries, *i. e.*, the group that vacillates between the social-chauvinists and the revolutionary internationalists. Kautsky discussed this subject in his journal (*Die Neue Zeit*,⁴⁶ April 6, 1917) in an article entitled, "The Prospects of the Russian Revolution."

"First of all," says Kautsky, "we must make clear to ourselves the problems confronting the revolutionary proletarian régime."

"Two things," continues the author, "are absolutely necessary to the proletariat: democracy and Socialism."

Unfortunately, this absolutely incontestable premise is propounded by Kautsky in an extremely generalised form, so that it really offers nothing and clarifies nothing. Miliukov and Kerensky, members of the bourgeois and imperialist government, would readily subscribe to this general premise, the one to the former, the other to the latter part. . . .*

Written April 8, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

* Manuscript unfinished.—*Ed.*

THE REVOLUTION IN RUSSIA AND THE TASKS OF THE WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES⁴⁷

COMRADE-WORKERS:

The forecast of those Socialists who have remained faithful to Socialism without succumbing to the poison of the savage and beastly war spirit, has proven to be correct. The first revolution, caused by the world-wide predatory war among the capitalists of various countries, has broken out. The imperialist war, *i.e.*, the war for the division of spoils among the capitalists, for the crushing of weak peoples, has begun to change into civil war, *i.e.*, a war of the workers against the capitalists, a war of the toilers and the oppressed against their oppressors, against tsars and kings, land-owners and capitalists, a war for the complete liberation of humanity from wars, from poverty of the masses, from oppression of one man by another!

The honour and the good fortune of being the initiators of the revolution, *i.e.*, of the great, the only legitimate and just war, the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, has fallen to the lot of the Russian workers.

The Petrograd workers have vanquished the tsarist monarchy. In their heroic struggle against the police and the Tsar's armies, the workers, having started the uprising unarmed in face of machine guns, have won over to their side the majority of the soldiers of the Petrograd garrison. The same thing occurred in Moscow and in other cities. Abandoned by his armies, the Tsar had to capitulate: he signed an abdication for himself and his son. He proposed that the throne be transferred to his brother Michael.

Owing to the great rapidity of the overturn, owing to the direct help of Anglo-French capitalists, owing to insufficient class-consciousness among the workers and the masses of the people in Petrograd, owing to the organisation and preparedness of the Russian landowners and capitalists, the latter have succeeded in seizing the state power. The most important posts, the premiership and the Ministries of the Interior and War in the new Russian govern-

ment, the "Provisional Government,"⁴⁸ have been given to Lvov and Guchkov, the Octobrists who had energetically assisted Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman in crushing the revolution of 1905, in shooting down and hanging workers and peasants who fought for land and freedom. The less important ministerial posts have been allotted to the Cadets: that of Foreign Affairs to Miliukov, of Education to Manuilov, of Agriculture to Shingarev. One quite insignificant little post, that of Minister of Justice, has been given to the Trudovik Kerensky, a glib-tongued fellow whom the capitalists need for the purpose of pacifying the people with empty promises, fooling them with high sounding phrases, reconciling them to the government of the landowners and capitalists who in union with the capitalists of France and England wish to continue the predatory war, a war for the seizure of Armenia, Constantinople, Galicia, a war to enable the Anglo-French capitalists to retain the booty which they have taken from the German capitalists (all the German colonies in Africa), and, at the same time, to recover the spoils seized by the German capitalist-robbers (a part of France, Belgium, Serbia, Rumania, etc.).

Clearly, the workers could not trust such a government. The workers had overthrown the tsarist monarchy in their struggle for peace, bread, and freedom. The workers immediately saw why Guchkov, Miliukov and Co. succeeded in wresting the victory from the hands of the working people. The reason was that the Russian landlords and capitalists were well prepared and organised; that they had on their side the force of capital, the wealth both of the Russian capitalists and of the richest capitalists in the world, the English and the French. The workers soon realised that in order to fight for peace, bread, and freedom, the labouring classes, the workers, the soldiers, and the peasants, must organise, unite, close their ranks independently of the capitalists and in opposition to them.

Thus the Petrograd workers, having overthrown the tsarist monarchy, immediately created their own organisation, the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, immediately proceeded to strengthen and extend it, to create *independent* Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Only a few days after the revolution, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies comprised over 1,500 Deputies of workers and peasants dressed in soldiers' uniforms. Such was the confidence of the railroad workers and of the entire mass of the

labouring population in this Soviet, that it began to develop into a real people's government.

And even the most faithful friends and protectors of Guchkov-Miliukov, even the most faithful watchdogs of Anglo-French predatory capital, the staff-correspondent of the richest newspaper of the English capitalists, Robert Wilson of the *Times*, and the staff-correspondent of the richest paper of the French capitalists, Charles Rivet of the *Temps*, even they, while hurling curses at the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, have been forced to admit that there are two governments in Russia. One—recognised by "everybody" (actually, by everybody among the wealthy), the government of the landowners and the capitalists, of the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs. The other—recognised by "nobody" (of the wealthy classes), the government of the workers and the peasants—the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies that is trying to establish throughout Russia Soviets of Workers' and Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.

Let us see, now, what is being said and what is being done by each of these two governments.

1. What is being done by the government of the landowners and the capitalists, the government of Lvov-Guchkov-Miliukov?

This government is handing out the most glorious promises right and left. It promises the Russian people the fullest freedom. It promises to convoke a national Constituent Assembly which shall determine the form of government for Russia. Kerensky and the Cadet leaders declare themselves in favour of a democratic republic. In the matter of theatrical revolutionism, the Guchkovs-Miliukovs are unsurpassable. Their publicity machine is working at top speed. But what about their deeds?

While promising freedom, the new government conducted negotiations with the Tsar's family, with the dynasty, concerning the restoration of the monarchy. It offered Michael Romanov the regency, *i. e.*, he was to become a temporary Tsar. Monarchy in Russia would have been restored, had not the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs been stopped by the workers, who paraded through the streets of Petrograd, who inscribed on their banners: "Land and Freedom! Death to the Tyrants!"—who, together with the cavalry regiments, assembled on the square in front of the Duma and unfurled banners with the inscription: "Long Live Socialist Republics in All Countries!" The ally of the Guchkovs-Miliukovs,

Michael Romanov, realised that under the circumstances, it would be wiser to decline the proffer until he should be chosen to the throne by the Constituent Assembly, and Russia has—temporarily—remained a republic.

The government did not deprive the former Tsar of his freedom. The workers compelled his arrest. The government wanted to hand over the command of the army to Nicholas Nicholaievich Romanov. The workers forced his removal. Naturally, the landowners, the Lvovs-Guchkovs, would come to terms with a Romanov or with some other landowner even to-morrow, had there not been the Soviet of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The government announced, in its Manifesto to the people and in the telegram which Miliukov has sent to all the Russian representatives abroad, that it remained faithful to all the international treaties entered into by Russia. These treaties were made by the deposed Tsar. The government does not dare to publish these treaties—first, because it is bound hand and foot by Russian, English, and French capital; second, because it fears that the people would tear the Guchkovs and the Miliukovs to pieces, if it discovered that the capitalists are ready to sacrifice five or ten more millions of workers and peasants in order to win Constantinople, crush Galicia, etc.

Of what good, then, are the promises of freedom, if the people are not allowed to know the truth about the treaties of the land-owner-Tsar for which the capitalists are ready to shed more and more of the soldiers' blood?

Of what good are the promises of various liberties and even of a democratic republic to a people threatened with famine, a people whom they wish to lead blindfold to slaughter in order that the Russian, English, and French capitalists may rob the German capitalists?

At the same time the government of the Guchkovs and Miliukovs is crushing by sheer force every attempt of the Russian workers to come to an understanding with their brothers, the workers of the other countries: neither the *Pravda*, the publication of which has been resumed in Petrograd since the revolution, nor the Manifesto issued in Petrograd by the Central Committee of our party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, nor yet the proclamations of the Duma Deputy Chkheidze and his group, were allowed by the government to be sent abroad from Russia.

Workers and peasants! You may rest assured: You have been promised freedom—freedom for the dead, freedom for those who have died of hunger, who have been slaughtered in the war!

Not one word about land for the peasants or higher wages for the workers has been said by the government in any of its programmes. No date has as yet been set for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. No elections to the Petrograd city council have as yet been called. The people's militia is being placed under the direction of the zemstvos and the municipal governments which, in accordance with the Stolypin law, were elected by the capitalists and the richest landowners only. Governors are being appointed from the landowning class—and this is "freedom."

2. What is being done and what should be done by the government of the workers and the peasants? . . .*

Written March 25, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

* Manuscript unfinished.—*Ed.*

LETTER TO J. S. HANECKI ⁴⁸

March 30.

DEAR COMRADE:

I am sincerely grateful to you for your attention and your help. Of course, I cannot avail myself of the services of people who have any connection with the publisher of the *Glocke*.⁵⁰ I have telegraphed to you to-day that the only hope we have of getting out of here is through an exchange of [Russian] immigrants in Switzerland for interned Germans [in Russia]. Under no conditions will England allow either me or any internationalist,⁵¹ or Martov and his friends,⁵² or Natanson and his friends,⁵³ to pass through. The English have forced Chernov to return to France, despite the fact that he had all the papers necessary for his passage!! Clearly, the Russian proletarian revolution has no more malignant enemy than the English imperialists. Clearly, the agent of Anglo-French imperialist capital and the Russian imperialists, Miliukov (and Co.), are capable of anything, of deception, of treason, of anything, anything, as long as they succeed in keeping the internationalists from returning to Russia. Reliance, be it ever so slight, in this case, on Miliukov and on Kerensky (a mere babbler, whose rôle, objectively, is that of an agent of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie) would be simply disastrous to the labour movement and to our party, would be well-nigh treason to internationalism. Our only chance, I say this without wishing to exaggerate, is to send as soon as possible a reliable man into Russia who will bring the pressure of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies to bear upon the government in order that it may exchange the immigrants in Switzerland for the interned Germans. We must act with much haste, keeping a record of every step, sparing no money on telegrams, collecting documents against Miliukov and Co., who are apt to procrastinate, to feed us with promises, to deceive, etc. You may well imagine what torture it is for all of us to stay here at such a time.

Furthermore, questions of principle make the despatch of a reliable man to Russia even more urgent. The latest reports in the foreign press clearly point to the fact that the government, with

Workers and peasants! You may rest assured: You have been promised freedom—freedom for the dead, freedom for those who have died of hunger, who have been slaughtered in the war!

Not one word about land for the peasants or higher wages for the workers has been said by the government in any of its programmes. No date has as yet been set for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. No elections to the Petrograd city council have as yet been called. The people's militia is being placed under the direction of the zemstvos and the municipal governments which, in accordance with the Stolypin law, were elected by the capitalists and the richest landowners only. Governors are being appointed from the landowning class—and this is "freedom."

2. What is being done and what should be done by the government of the workers and the peasants? . . .*

Written March 25, 1917.

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

* Manuscript unfinished.—*Ed.*

LETTER TO J. S. HANECKI ⁴⁸

March 30.

DEAR COMRADE:

I am sincerely grateful to you for your attention and your help. Of course, I cannot avail myself of the services of people who have any connection with the publisher of the *Glocke*.⁵⁰ I have telegraphed to you to-day that the only hope we have of getting out of here is through an exchange of [Russian] immigrants in Switzerland for interned Germans [in Russia]. Under no conditions will England allow either me or any internationalist,⁵¹ or Martov and his friends,⁵² or Natanson and his friends,⁵³ to pass through. The English have forced Chernov to return to France, despite the fact that he had all the papers necessary for his passage!! Clearly, the Russian proletarian revolution has no more malignant enemy than the English imperialists. Clearly, the agent of Anglo-French imperialist capital and the Russian imperialists, Miliukov (and Co.), are capable of anything, of deception, of treason, of anything, anything, as long as they succeed in keeping the internationalists from returning to Russia. Reliance, be it ever so slight, in this case, on Miliukov and on Kerensky (a mere babbler, whose rôle, objectively, is that of an agent of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie) would be simply disastrous to the labour movement and to our party, would be well-nigh treason to internationalism. Our only chance, I say this without wishing to exaggerate, is to send as soon as possible a reliable man into Russia who will bring the pressure of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies to bear upon the government in order that it may exchange the immigrants in Switzerland for the interned Germans. We must act with much haste, keeping a record of every step, sparing no money on telegrams, collecting documents against Miliukov and Co., who are apt to procrastinate, to feed us with promises, to deceive, etc. You may well imagine what torture it is for all of us to stay here at such a time.

Furthermore, questions of principle make the despatch of a reliable man to Russia even more urgent. The latest reports in the foreign press clearly point to the fact that the government, with

the direct aid of Kerensky and thanks to the unpardonable (mildly speaking) vacillations of Chkheidze, is hoodwinking the workers, and quite successfully, by declaring this imperialist war to be a war of "defence." According to the Petrograd Telegraph Agency despatch of March 30, 1917, Chkheidze has allowed himself to be fooled by this slogan, which—if we should believe this source, usually unreliable, of course—has also been adopted by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. In any case, even if this report prove false, the dangerous possibility of such deception is tremendous. Every effort of the party must be directed to fight it. Our party would completely disgrace itself, would commit political suicide, if it were lured by such deception. According to one report, Muranov returned from Cronstadt together with Skobelev. If Muranov had gone there at the behest of the Provisional Government of the Guchkovs-Miliukovs, then please transmit to our comrades (through the reliable person) and announce in our papers that I unqualifiedly condemn this action, that any connection with those inclining toward social-patriotism and with those taking the deeply erroneous, terribly harmful social-pacifist Kautskian position of Chkheidze and Co., is, according to my deepest conviction, harmful to the working class, dangerous, and not to be allowed.

I hope you have received my "Letters From Afar," numbers 1-4,* in which I have developed the theoretical and political bases of these views. If those letters have been lost or have not reached Petrograd, please telegraph, and I will send copies.

Undoubtedly the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies includes a large and apparently even a preponderant number of (1) followers of Kerensky, a very dangerous agent of the imperialist bourgeoisie who under the smoke screen of sonorous phrases and empty promises is doing the work of imperialism, namely, defending and justifying the predatory war, a war of conquest on the part of Russia; (2) followers of Chkheidze, who is leaning shamelessly toward social-patriotism and is sharing all the vulgarity and absurdity of Kautskyism. Our party must fight both trends most vigorously, most fundamentally, most persistently, most mercilessly. I personally do not hesitate for a moment to declare in print that I would rather face a break with any one in our party, than make concessions to the social-patriotism of Kerensky and Co. or to the social-pacifism and Kautskyism of Chkheidze and Co.

* See pp. 27-61 of this book.—*Ed.*

I must request and insist that the following be reprinted in Petrograd, under, say, the heading "From the History of the Last Years of Tsarism": the *Social-Democrat*, published here; Lenin and Zinoviev's pamphlet on the war⁵⁴ and Socialism; the *Communist*⁵⁵ and the collection of articles from the *Social-Democrat*.⁵⁶ But above and before anything else the *theses* from No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat*, October 13, 1915.* These theses are now extremely important.

These theses tell directly, clearly and precisely what we should do in the event of a revolution in Russia—they tell it a year and a half before the revolution!

These theses have been remarkably well, nay, literally, confirmed by the revolution.

As far as Russia is concerned the war has not ceased to be imperialist, nor can it cease to be such (1) while landowners and capitalists, representatives of the bourgeoisie, are in power; (2) while such direct agents and servants of the bourgeoisie as Kerensky and other social-patriots are in power; (3) while the treaties between tsarism and the Anglo-French imperialists remain in force (the government of Guchkov-Miliukov has openly declared abroad—I do not know whether it has done so in Russia—that it means to abide by the treaties). These treaties are predatory treaties, dealing as they do with the seizure of Galicia, Armenia, Constantinople and so on and so forth; (4) while these treaties are not published or abrogated; (5) while the alliance between Russia and the Anglo-French bourgeois imperialist governments remains in force; (6) while in Russia state power is not taken from the imperialist bourgeoisie (simple promises and "pacifist" declarations, however much the foolish little Kautskys, Chkhheidzes and Co. believe in them, will not transform the bourgeoisie into *non*-bourgeoisie) and placed in the hands of the proletariat which alone is capable, if it be supported by the poorest peasants, of breaking not merely in words but in deeds with capitalist interests, with imperialist politics, which alone is capable of ending the pillage of foreign countries, of completely freeing all the nationalities oppressed by the Great-Russians, of taking the army out of Armenia and Galicia, etc.; (7) only the proletariat is able, if it only rid itself of the influence of its national bourgeoisie, to inspire the proletarians of all the warring countries with real confidence, and to

* See *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, article "A Few Theses. Editors."—Ed.

enter with them into peace negotiations; (8) these proletarian conditions for peace are presented precisely and clearly in No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat*, and also in my Fourth Letter.

Hence it is clear that the slogan: we are now defending the republic in Russia, we are now carrying on a "war of defence," we shall continue to fight against Wilhelm, we are fighting for the downfall of Wilhelm, is the biggest lie, is the worst deception of the workers! For Guchkov-Lvov-Miliukov and Co. are landowners and capitalists, representatives of the class of landowners and capitalists, they are imperialists fighting for the same predatory aims, on the strength of the same predatory treaties of tsarism, in alliance with the same imperialist and predatory bourgeoisie of England, France, and Italy.

When the bourgeois and imperialist republic of Russia calls upon the Germans to "overthrow Wilhelm," it simply repeats the lying slogans of the French social-chauvinists, Jules Guesde, Sembat and Co., who have turned traitors to Socialism.

We must tell the workers and soldiers in a simple, popular language, free of learned words, that it is their duty to overthrow not only Wilhelm, but the English and the Italian kings as well. That is the first thing. Secondly and chiefly, it is their duty to overthrow the bourgeois governments, and we must begin with Russia, because otherwise we shall never attain peace. It is possible that we shall not be able to "overthrow" the government of Guchkov-Miliukov immediately. Supposing that to be the case, it still would be no reason for telling an untruth! The workers should be told the truth. They should be told that the government of Guchkov-Miliukov and Co. is an imperialist government, that the workers and the peasants must first of all (either now or after the Constituent Assembly shall have been elected—if the latter does not prove a hoax on the people, and is not postponed till after the war—the question of the proper moment cannot be settled from here) transfer all the state power to the working class, the enemy of capital, the enemy of the imperialist war, and that only then will they have the right to demand the overthrow of all kings and of all bourgeois governments.

For God's sake, try to get all this into Petrograd and into the *Pravda*, to Muranov, to Kamenev, and others. For God's sake, make every effort to forward it through a very reliable person. It would be best to send a clever, trustworthy chap like Kuba (he

would render a great service to the working-class movement of the whole world) to help our Petrograd friends! I hope you will do it! Do everything possible.

Conditions in Petrograd are most difficult. The republican patriots are exerting all their strength. They are trying to throw filth and mud at our party (the "case" of Chernomazov—I am sending a document relating to him), etc., etc.

We must trust neither Chkheidze and Co., nor Sukhanov, nor Steklov. No rapprochement with other parties, with none of them! Not the slightest confidence in or support of the government of Guchkov-Miliukov and Co.! Implacable propaganda of internationalism and of war upon republican chauvinism and social-chauvinism everywhere, both in the press and within the Soviet of Workers' Deputies; the organisation of our party—this is the main thing. Kamenev must realise that on his shoulders rests a responsibility of historical and universal import.⁵⁷

Spare no money to keep up connections between Petrograd and Stockholm!

I beg of you, dear comrade, to telegraph me of the receipt of this letter, and generally to keep me posted on everything that is going on. I hope our Swedish friends will also help us in this matter. I shake your hand firmly.

Yours,

LENIN.

First published from manuscript in the *Proletarskaia Revolutsia* [Proletarian Revolution], No. 2, 1921.

TRICKS OF THE REPUBLICAN CHAUVINISTS⁵⁸

March 30, 1917.

I HAVE just read the following in to-day's early morning edition of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, No. 750, March 30:

Milan, March 29. Our Petrograd correspondent reports the arrest of a certain Chernomazov, editor of the Socialist paper *Pravda* which made its first appearance during the revolution. Under the old régime, Chernomazov was an agent of the secret police and received a monthly salary of two hundred rubles. The newspaper of which he was in charge has been clamouring for a Soviet republic and attacking bitterly the Provisional Government, with the obvious purpose of serving reaction. Altogether the agitation by irresponsible groups against the government prompts one to suspect collusion with the old régime and the enemy. Even the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which, in comparison with the Provisional Government, is decidedly radical, has turned away from these groups.

This report is a paraphrase of a telegram appearing in the chauvinist Italian paper, *Corriere della Sera*,⁵⁹ Milan, March 29, and sent there from Petrograd on March 26, at 10:30 P. M. To explain to the readers the falsification, a thing quite usual among the chauvinists, I must turn a bit to the past.

Under the "old régime," i. e., from April, 1912, to July, 1914, there was published in Petrograd a daily Social-Democratic paper, *Pravda*. In fact, this paper was the organ of the Central Committee of our party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. I used to contribute to that paper almost daily from Cracow, where I lived as a political emigrant. The Social-Democratic members of the Duma, Badaiev, Muranov, Petrovsky, Shagov, Samoilov (up to the summer of 1914 the group included also Malinovsky), who belonged to our party and whom the Tsar later exiled to Siberia for agitation against the imperialist war, regularly came to Cracow, and we conferred regarding the policies of the paper.

The Tsar's government naturally tried not only to surround the *Pravda*, a paper with a circulation of sixty thousand, with spies, but also to plant provocateurs on its staff. Among these provocateurs was Chernomazov, known in the party by the name of Miron.

He managed to gain the confidence of the party, and in 1913 became the secretary of the *Pravda*.

Having observed, together with a group of Duma Deputies, the activities of Chernomazov, we came to the conclusion (1) that in his articles he compromised our political line, and (2) that his political integrity was open to suspicion. It was difficult, however, to find a substitute, all the more so since the intercourse between the group of Deputies and Cracow was maintained surreptitiously, and through the Deputies' trips, which could not be made very often. Finally, in the spring of 1914, we succeeded in bringing Rosenfeld (Kamenev) over to Petrograd, but he, together with our Deputies, was exiled to Siberia toward the end of 1914.

Rosenfeld (Kamenev) was instructed to remove Chernomazov, which he did. Chernomazov was dismissed. Our Central Committee began an investigation, but since it was impossible to find positive evidence to substantiate the suspicions against Chernomazov, the Petrograd comrades did not decide to brand him openly as a provocateur. They were forced to limit themselves to the removal of Chernomazov from the *Pravda*.

There is no doubt that Chernomazov, and of course other provocateurs, had helped the Tsar to banish our Deputies to Siberia.

On November 13, 1916, we were informed by the Petrograd "Bureau of the Central Committee" of our party that Chernomazov was again trying to get into the illegal organisation, that the "Bureau" had removed from the organisation both "Miron" and another person connected with him, and that it intended "to treat similarly any one who continued to have any dealings with him."

Our reply, of course, was that Chernomazov's membership in the party was inadmissible, for he had been removed by the decision of the Central Committee and the above-named Deputies.

This is the story of the old *Pravda* published under the old régime and crushed by the Tsar before the war, in July, 1914. The question arises: Was not Chernomazov, directly or indirectly, connected with the new *Pravda* which began publication in Petrograd after the revolution? About this I know nothing, for ever since the revolution the government of Guchkov-Miliukov has allowed neither my telegrams to reach the *Pravda*, nor, of course, the telegrams of the *Pravda* to reach me. I do not even know whether the Bureau of the Central Committee is still in existence, or whether Kamenev and the Deputies, who know Miron and would have

immediately removed him if he had again wormed himself into the organisation by taking advantage of the change in its personnel, have returned to Petrograd.

The French social-chauvinist paper *L'Humanité*⁶⁰ of March 28 quoted a telegram supposedly received from Petrograd by the *Petit Parisien*.⁶¹ In this telegram Chernomazov is referred to as the "former editor of the extremist Social-Democratic paper, *Pravda*."

The reader will, we hope, understand now the treachery and the baseness of the methods used by the government of Guchkov-Miliukov and its friends, who are determined to cast a shadow on our party by suggesting that it is working in common with the old régime and the enemy. This government and its friends hate our party and slander it, because we declared as far back as October 13, 1915, in No. 47 of our paper the *Social-Democrat* (Geneva) that we were absolutely opposed to the imperialist war, even if it were to be conducted not by the Tsar's government, but by a chauvinist-revolutionary, chauvinist-republican Russian government.

The government of Guchkov-Miliukov is just such a government, for it has confirmed the predatory treaties concluded by tsarism with Anglo-French imperialism and in this war is pursuing predatory aims (the conquest of Armenia, Galicia, Constantinople, etc.).

N. LENIN.

(To-morrow I shall forward this to the *Volksrecht*⁶² and the *Avanti*).⁶³

First published from manuscript in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. II, 1924.

REPORT ON THE TASKS OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL- DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY IN THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION⁶⁴

THE most important prerequisite for the “miraculous” change in Russia was the “great rebellion”⁶⁵ of 1905-1907, so vilely denounced by the Guchkovs and Miliukovs, the present masters of the situation, who are now singing praises to the “glorious revolution”⁶⁶ of 1917. But had the revolution of 1905 not prepared the ground, had it not exposed to view all the parties and classes in action, had it not exposed the Tsar’s clique in all its barbarism and savagery, the swift victory of 1917 would have been impossible.

This particular combination of circumstances has made it possible in 1917 to unite the attack of most diverse social forces against tsarism.

Firstly: Anglo-French finance capital, which dominates and robs the whole world, had in 1905 opposed the revolution and helped the Tsar to crush it (the billion-ruble loan of 1906). But it took an active part in the present revolution, and, for the purpose of removing Nicholas II, it organised the conspiracy of Guchkov, Miliukov and the highest military circles.⁶⁷

From the point of view of world politics and international finance capital, the Guchkov-Miliukov government is nothing but a clerk of the banking firm England-France, an instrument for prolonging the imperialist slaughter of peoples.

Secondly: the military defeats suffered by the tsarist monarchy had thoroughly eliminated the old officers, and young, new officers sprang up, predominantly from among the bourgeoisie.

Thirdly: the entire Russian bourgeoisie, which between the years 1905 and 1914 and particularly between the years 1914 and 1917 had speedily organised in the hope of enriching itself by seizing Armenia, Constantinople, Galicia, etc., joined forces with the nobility in a common struggle against decayed tsarism.

Finally, fourthly—and this is of utmost importance: the actions of the imperialist forces were joined in by a deep and stormily unfolding proletarian movement. The proletariat demanded peace,

bread, and freedom. It had nothing in common with the imperialist bourgeoisie and it had behind it the majority of the army, composed of workers and peasants.

The imperialist war has begun to change into civil war. Herein lies the source of the dual character of this revolution, which represents the first stage of the first revolution brought about by the imperialist war.

The government of Guchkov and Miliukov, a government of landowners and capitalists, can give the people neither peace nor bread nor freedom. This government stands for the prolongation of the predatory war, and openly declares that it will abide by the international treaties concluded by the Tsar. These treaties are predatory treaties. At best, this government may manage to postpone the crisis but it cannot save the country from hunger. And no matter how many promises it makes, it cannot give the country freedom because it is bound by blood ties to the interests of the capitalists and the landowning nobility.

That is why it would be the most foolish thing imaginable to tie our hands by the tactics of confidence in and support of a government which is incapable of breaking with imperialism.

What tactics, then, is the proletariat to pursue? We are now undergoing a transition from the first to the second stage of the revolution, from the revolt against tsarism to the revolt against the bourgeoisie, against the imperialist war—a transition to the Convention⁶⁸ [French], which may evolve from the Constituent Assembly, should the government actually keep its promise and convoke it.

The special task of the present moment is to organise the proletariat; but not into the old accepted form of organisation which the traitors to Socialism, the social-patriots, the opportunists in all countries consider sufficient, but into a revolutionary organisation. This organisation must, first, be universal; secondly, it must combine military and state functions.

That is why the most foolish thing we can do is to adopt, supposedly for the purpose of “fighting reaction,” the tactics of giving confidence and support to the government. To fight reaction there must be an arming of the proletariat—this is the only serious, the only real guarantee against a tsarist counter-revolution, as well as against any attempts of Guchkov and Miliukov to restore the monarchy.

The Socialist Deputy Skobelev is right in saying that "Russia is on the eve of a second, the real revolution." The organisation of this revolution is already in existence. This is the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. No wonder the agents of Anglo-French capital, the correspondents of the *Times* and the *Temps*, are throwing mud at it.

A close study of the press communications relating to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies reveals three trends in that organisation. The first comes nearest to social-patriotism. It has confidence in the Minister of Justice, Kerensky, this hero of the empty phrase, this pawn in the hand of the Guchkovs and Miliukovs. He is quite liberal with sonorous phrases much in the manner of the West-European social-patriots and social-pacifists. In reality, however, he "reconciles" the workers to the continuation of the predatory war. Through the mouth of Kerensky the imperialist bourgeoisie tells the workers: We give you a republic, an eight-hour workday (which in fact has already been established in Petrograd), we promise you all sorts of liberties—but all this for the express purpose that you may help us rob Turkey and Austria, snatch from German imperialism its booty, and assure it for Anglo-French imperialism.

The second trend is represented by our Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. The papers have published an extract from the Manifesto of our Central Committee.⁶⁹ This Manifesto appeared in Petrograd on March 18. It puts forward the following demands: a democratic republic, an eight-hour workday, confiscation of the noblemen's lands for the purpose of transferring them to the peasants, confiscation of grain held in store, and immediate preparation for peace parleys to be conducted not by the government of Guchkov and Miliukov, but by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. This Soviet, according to the words in the above-mentioned Manifesto, is the actual revolutionary government (the correspondents of the *Times* and the *Temps* always speak of the existence of two governments in Russia). Peace negotiations are to be conducted not with the bourgeois governments, but with the proletariat of all the warring countries. The Manifesto calls upon all the workers, peasants and soldiers to send their representatives to the Soviet.

These are the only possible Socialist, revolutionary tactics.

The third trend is represented by Chkheidze and his friends.

They are always vacillating, and this is reflected in the remarks of the *Times* and the *Temps*, now praising, now execrating them. When Chkheidze refused to enter the second Provisional Government,⁷⁰ when he declared that the war was an imperialist war, he was pursuing a proletarian policy. When, however, Chkheidze took part in the first government (the committee of the Duma); when he, in the third paragraph of his proclamation, demanded adequate participation in the government of representatives of the Russian working class (participation of internationalists in the government of the imperialist war!); when he, together with Skobelev, invited this imperialist government to open peace negotiations (instead of declaring to the workers that the bourgeoisie is bound hand and foot by the interests of financial capital, that it cannot break with imperialism); when friends of Chkheidze—Tuliakov and Skobelev—travel about at the order of the government of Guchkov and Miliukov, pacifying the soldiers who are rising against the liberal-bourgeois generals (the killing of Admiral Neponin), then Chkheidze and his friends are following a most vile bourgeois policy, and are doing harm to the revolution.

Marx teaches us, on the basis of the experience of the Commune of 1871, that “the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state-machine and make it serve its own purposes.”⁷¹ The proletariat must smash this machine (the army, the police, the bureaucracy). It is this that the opportunists are denying or minimising. This is the most important practical lesson to be learned from the Paris Commune and the Russian Revolution of 1905.

We are different from the Anarchists in that we recognise that a government is necessary to accomplish a revolutionary overturn. But we differ from the opportunists and the Kautskians in that we insist that we do not need a “ready-made” state-machine as it exists in democratic bourgeois republics, but actual power in the hands of the armed and organised workers. This is the state that we need. In their essence the Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies in Russia in 1905 and 1917 were just such a state. On this foundation we must build further.

Our conditions for peace are as follows:

1. The Soviet of Workers’ Deputies, being a revolutionary government, declares forthwith that it does not regard itself bound by any treaties made by the Tsar or the bourgeoisie.

2. It publishes forthwith all these predatory treaties.
3. It openly proposes to all the belligerents the immediate cessation of military operations.
4. As a basis for peace it suggests the liberation of all the colonies and all the oppressed nations.
5. It declares that it has no confidence in all the bourgeois governments. It calls upon the workers of the world to overthrow their governments.
6. The war loans contracted by the bourgeoisie must be paid exclusively by the capitalists.

This policy would attract the majority of workers and poorest peasants to the Social-Democracy. The confiscation of the noblemen's lands would be assured; this, however, would not yet be Socialism.

For such peace conditions we, too, would be willing to carry on a revolutionary war. In such a revolutionary war we could depend on the help of the revolutionary proletariat.

Volksrecht [Zürich], Nos. 77 and 78, March 31 and April 2, 1917. Translated from the German.

FAREWELL LETTER TO THE SWISS WORKERS⁷²

COMRADES, SWISS WORKERS:

Leaving Switzerland for Russia, in order to continue the revolutionary-internationalist work in our country, we, members of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party united under the Central Committee (in distinction from another party bearing the same name but united under the Organisation Committee), wish to convey to you our fraternal greetings and expression of our profound comradely gratitude for your comradely attitude to the political emigrants.

If the avowed social-patriots and opportunists, the Swiss Gruetlians who, like the social-patriots of all countries, have deserted the camp of the proletariat for the camp of the bourgeoisie; if these people have openly called upon you to fight against the harmful influence of foreigners upon the Swiss labour movement; if the disguised social-patriots and opportunists who constitute a majority among the leaders of the Swiss Socialist Party have been pursuing similar tactics under cover, we think it necessary to declare that on the part of the revolutionary Socialist workers of Switzerland holding internationalist views we have met with warm sympathy, and have derived a great deal of benefit from our comradely relations with them.

We have always been particularly careful in dealing with those questions of the Swiss movement, acquaintance with which requires prolonged participation in the local movement. But those of us who have been members of the Swiss Socialist Party, the number hardly exceeding from ten to fifteen, have regarded it as our duty steadfastly to maintain our point of view, *i. e.*, the point of view of the "Zimmerwald Left,"⁷³ on general and fundamental questions pertaining to the international and Socialist movement, to fight determinedly not only social-patriotism, but also the line of the so-called "centre" to which belong R. Grimm, F. Schneider, Jacques Schmidt, and others in Switzerland, Kautsky, Haase, and the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* in Germany,⁷⁴ Longuet, Pressemann, and others in France, Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald, and others in

England, Turati, Treves, and their friends in Italy, and the above-mentioned party headed by the Organisation Committee (Axelrod, Martov, Chkheidze, Skobelev, and others) in Russia.

We have worked hand in hand with those revolutionary Social-Democrats of Switzerland who were grouped about the magazine, *Freie Jugend*,⁷⁵ who formulated and circulated (in the German and French languages) the proposals for the holding of a referendum regarding a party conference in April, 1917, to take up the question of the party's attitude to the war; who at the convention of the Zürich Canton in Töss introduced the resolution of the young and the "Lefts" dealing with the question of war; who in March, 1917, issued and circulated in certain localities of French Switzerland a leaflet in the German and French languages entitled, "Our Conditions of Peace," etc.

We are sending our fraternal greetings to these comrades, with whom we have been working together, in agreement.

We have not, and we never had, the slightest doubt that the imperialist government of England will under no circumstances permit the return to Russia of Russian internationalists, who are irrevocably against the imperialist government of Guchkov-Miliukov and Co., and irrevocably against the continuation of the imperialist war by Russia.

In connection with this we must say a few words about our understanding of the tasks of the Russian Revolution. We deem this all the more necessary because through the Swiss workers we can and must address ourselves to the German, French, and Italian workers, who speak the same languages as the population of Switzerland that still enjoys the advantages of peace and the relatively greatest political freedom.

We remain unconditionally loyal to the declaration which we made in the central organ of our party, No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat* (October 13, 1915), published in Geneva. We stated there that should the revolution prove victorious in Russia, and should a republican government, a government intent on continuing the imperialist war, a war in league with the imperialist bourgeoisie of England and France, a war for the purpose of seizing Constantinople, Armenia, Galicia, etc., etc., find itself in power, that we would be most resolutely opposed to such a government, that we would be against the "defence of the fatherland" in such a war.

A contingency approaching the above has now arisen. The new

government of Russia, which has conducted negotiations with the brother of Nicholas II with regard to the restoration of the monarchy in Russia, and in which the most important and influential posts have been given to the monarchists Lvov and Guchkov, this government is trying to deceive the workers by the slogan, "the Germans must overthrow Wilhelm" (correct, but why not add: the English, the Italians, etc., must do the same to their own kings; and the Russians must remove their monarchists Lvov and Guchkov?). This government, by using the above slogan, while refusing to publish the imperialist, predatory treaties concluded by the Tsar with France, England, etc., and confirmed by the government of Guchkov-Miliukov-Kerensky, is trying to represent its imperialist war with Germany as a war of "defence" (*i. e.*, as a just war, legitimate even from the point of view of the proletariat)—is trying to represent a war for the defence of the bloodthirsty, imperialist, predatory aims of capital—Russian, English, etc., as the "defence" of the republic (which does not yet exist in Russia, and which the Lvovs and the Guchkovs have not even promised to establish).

If there is truth in the latest telegraphic reports that the avowed Russian social-patriots (such as Plekhanov, Zasulich, Potresov, etc.) have entered into something like a rapprochement with the party of the "centre," the party of the "Organisation Committee," the party of Chkhheidze, Skobelev, etc., on the basis of a common slogan: "While the Germans do not overthrow Wilhelm, our war remains a defensive war,"—if this is true, then we shall redouble our energy in carrying on the struggle against the party of Chkhheidze, Skobelev, etc., which we have always waged against that party for its opportunist, vacillating, unstable political behaviour.

Our slogan is: No support to the government of Guchkov-Miliukov! He who says that such support is necessary in order to fight against the restoration of the monarchy deceives the people. On the contrary, it is this very government of Guchkov that has already conducted negotiations concerning the restoration of the monarchy in Russia. Only the arming of the proletariat can prevent Guchkov and Co. from restoring monarchy in Russia. Only the proletariat of Russia and the rest of Europe, remaining loyal to internationalism, is capable of ridding humanity of the horrors of the imperialist war.

We do not close our eyes to the tremendous difficulties facing the revolutionary-internationalist vanguard of the Russian proletariat.

In these times most sudden and swift changes are possible. In No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat* we gave a clear and direct answer to the question that naturally arises: What would our party do, if the revolution placed it immediately in power? Our answer was: 1. We would forthwith offer peace to all the warring peoples; 2. We would announce our peace conditions consisting of immediate liberation of all the colonies and all the oppressed and non-sovereign peoples; 3. We would immediately begin and carry out the liberation of all the peoples oppressed by the Great-Russians; 4. We do not deceive ourselves for one moment, we know that such conditions would be unacceptable not only to the monarchist but also to the republican bourgeoisie of Germany, and not only to Germany, but also to the capitalist governments of England and France.

We would be forced to carry on a revolutionary struggle against the German—and not only the German—bourgeoisie. *This struggle we would carry on.* We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars over the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always considered it absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to disavow revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of Socialism.

The task that we outlined in No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat* is of gigantic proportions. It can be solved only by a long series of great class conflicts between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. However, it was not our impatience, nor our wishes, but the objective conditions created by the imperialist war that brought humanity to an impasse, that placed it in a dilemma: either to allow the destruction of more millions of lives and utterly ruin the entire European civilisation, or to hand over the power in *all* the civilised countries to the revolutionary proletariat, to realise the Socialist overturn.

The great honour of beginning the series of revolutions caused with objective inevitability by the war has fallen to the Russian proletariat. But the idea that the Russian proletariat is the chosen revolutionary proletariat among the workers of the world is absolutely alien to us. We know full well that the proletariat of Russia is less organised, less prepared, and less class-conscious than the proletariat of other countries. It is not its special qualities but rather the special coincidence of historical circumstances that has made the proletariat of Russia for a certain, perhaps very short

time, the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world.

Russia is a peasant country, it is one of the most backward of European countries. Socialism cannot triumph there immediately. But the present character of the country in the face of a vast reserve of land retained by noblemen landowners may, to judge from the experience of 1905, give tremendous sweep to the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia, and may make our revolution a prologue to the world Socialist revolution, a step forward in that direction.

In the struggle for these ideas, which have been fully confirmed by the experience of 1905 and the spring of 1917, in the struggle against all the other parties, our party was formed, and for these ideas we shall continue to struggle.

In Russia Socialism cannot triumph directly and immediately. But the peasant mass may bring the inevitable and ripe agrarian upheaval to the point of confiscating all the immense holdings of the landowners. This has always been our slogan and now the Petrograd and the Central Committees of our party, as well as the paper of our party, *Pravda*, have again brought it to the fore. The proletariat is going to fight for this slogan without closing its eyes to the inevitability of cruel class conflicts between the hired agricultural workers and the impoverished peasants closely allied with them on the one hand and the prosperous peasants whose position has been strengthened by the agrarian "reform"¹⁶ of Stolypin (1907-1914) on the other. One must not forget that 104 peasant Deputies in the first (1906) and second (1907) Dumas came forward with a revolutionary agrarian bill demanding the nationalisation of all lands and the management of such lands by local committees elected on the basis of complete democracy.

Such an overturn would, in itself, not be Socialism as yet. But it would give a great impetus to the world labour movement. It would greatly strengthen the position of a Socialist overturn in Russia, and of its influence on the agricultural workers and the poorest peasants. It would enable the city proletariat to develop, on the strength of this influence, a revolutionary organisation like the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, to replace by them the old instruments of oppression used by the bourgeois states, the army, the police, the bureaucracy; to put into effect, under the pressure of the unbearably burdensome imperialist war and its consequences, a

series of revolutionary measures to insure control over the production and distribution of goods.

The Russian proletariat single-handed cannot bring the Socialist revolution to a victorious conclusion. But it can give the Russian Revolution a mighty sweep such as would create most favourable conditions for a Socialist revolution, and would, in a sense, start it. It can help create more favourable circumstances for its most important, most trustworthy and most reliable collaborator, the European and the American Socialist proletariat, to join in the decisive battles.

Let the sceptics despair because of the temporary triumph within the European Socialist movement of such disgusting lackeys of the imperialist bourgeoisie as the Scheidemanns, the Legiens, the Davids and Co. in Germany; Sembat, Guesde, Renaudel and Co. in France; the Fabians⁷⁷ and the Labourites⁷⁸ in England. We are firmly convinced that this filthy froth on the surface of the world labour movement will be soon swept away by the waves of the revolution.

In Germany there is already a seething unrest of the proletarian masses that contributed so much to humanity and Socialism by their persistent, unyielding, sustained organisational work during the many decades of the period of European "calm" from 1871 to 1914. The future of German Socialism is represented not by the traitors, the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Davids and Co., nor by the vacillating and spineless ones, Haase, Kautsky and their ilk, who have been enfeebled by the routine of the period of political "peace."

The future belongs to that tendency which has given us Karl Liebknecht, which has created the "Spartacus group,"⁷⁹ which has carried on its propaganda in the Bremen *Arbeiterpolitik*.⁸⁰

The objective circumstances of the imperialist war make it certain that the revolution will not be limited to the first stage of the Russian Revolution, that the revolution will not be limited to Russia.

The German proletariat is the most trustworthy, the most reliable ally of the Russian and the world proletarian revolution.

When in November, 1914, our party had put forward the slogan "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war" of the oppressed against the oppressors for the attainment of Socialism, this slogan was met with the hatred and malicious ridicule of the social-patriots and with the incredulous, sceptical, meek and expectant silence of the Social-Democratic "centre." David, the German social-chauvinist

and social-imperialist, called it “insane,” while Mr. Plekhanov, the representative of Russian (and Anglo-French) social-chauvinism, of Socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, called it “a dream farce” (*Mittelding zwischen Traum und Komoedie* *). The representatives of the “centre” confined themselves to silence or to cheap little jokes about this “straight line drawn in empty space.”

Now, after March, 1917, only the blind can fail to see that this slogan is correct. The turning of the imperialist war into civil war is becoming a fact.

Long live the proletarian revolution that is beginning in Europe!

Upon the instruction of the departing comrades, members of the R.S.-D.L.P. (united under the Central Committee), who have passed on this letter at a meeting held April 8, 1917.

N. LENIN.

Written April 8, 1917, and first published from manuscript in the *Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, No. 2, 1921.

* Something between a dream and a comedy.—*Ed.*

ARTICLES, REPORTS AND SPEECHES IMMEDIATELY AFTER
THE RETURN TO RUSSIA
FROM APRIL 17 TO APRIL 28, 1917

Мартъ нынѣ десятка.
Часть 2.
Новое правительство и проводимая имъ

Бывшій документомъ, которою я распорядилъ
по сегодняшнему числу (8/21 марта), Это - конецъ време-
нной Консервативной и Буржуазной группы „Ti-
mes“ (Лондонъ) она 16/3 со свободой соединена съ революци-
ей въ Россіи. Ано, что изъ этого, бывшіе министры -
Барракъ и Санджакъ - наследники и правительства
Туркова и Ильинова, заѣти не могутъ.

Корреспонденція этой группы состояла въ Нью-
Йоркѣ отъ среды 1(14) марта, когда существовало еще
многотысячное буржуазное правительство М. Е. Думскаго
Исполнительного Комитета. Комунальный 13 марта, съ 10-30 ч.
коѣ въ этотъ же день, во Второмъ засѣданіи, „согра-
ничили“ Керенскаго съ должности министра, - сего
дня же:

„Группа нынѣ 22 марта послала Т. С. Соловьеву, Губ-
ернатору, Саратову, Трудовому; проф. Васильеву, Землем., Ведом.-
ству и т. д.; опровергнула бывшіе мѣстеческіе газеты, гласивши
что ейъ отказано въ „занятіи“ и пр. а т. д. составъ группъ и
издѣлія группъ бывшаго правительства, находившееся „дѣлами
нашихъ“. Краско будущіе планы Керенскаго, которою
сегодня группъ оговаривъ, какъ наилѣпшую въ зданіи въ-
сѧхъ, - пакъ корреспонденція въ одно время совершенно
исчезла. Если это Бендереско не подастъ себѣ въ
изведеніи группъ съсѣднихъ земельныхъ

Facsimile of the First Page of the "Second Letter" of Lenin's
"Letters from Afar," March 22, 1917 (see p. 36).

HOW WE ARRIVED⁸¹

REPORT TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE [OF THE SOVIET] MADE BY LENIN AND ZINOVIEV UPON THE INSTRUCTION OF THE COMRADES WHO CAME FROM SWITZERLAND

News that the English and French governments have denied the emigrant-internationalists passage to Russia has already reached the Socialist press.

The thirty-two political emigrants of various party affiliations (among them 19 Bolsheviks, 6 Bundists,⁸² 3 adherents of the Paris nationalist paper *Nashe Slovo*)⁸³ who have arrived here regard it as their duty to make known the following:

We have in our possession a series of documents which we will make known as soon as we receive them from Stockholm (we have left them behind because the representatives of the English government are complete masters on the Swedish-Russian border), and which will give a clear picture of the deplorable rôle played by the above-named "Allied" governments in this matter. On this point we shall add only the following: The Zürich Committee for the evacuation of emigrants which comprises representatives of twenty-three groups (among them the Central Committee, the Organisation Committee, the Socialists-Revolutionists, the Bund, etc.) has unanimously passed a resolution stating publicly that the English government had decided to rob the emigrant internationalists of the opportunity to return to their native land and to take part in the activities against the imperialist war.

Ever since the first days of the revolution this intention of the English government had become quite clear to the emigrants. At a conference of representatives of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party (M. A. Natanson), the Organisation Committee of the R.S.-D.L.P. (L. Martov), and the Bund (Kossovsky), a plan was conceived (it was proposed by L. Martov) to obtain for these emigrants passage through Germany in exchange for the German and Austrian prisoners interned in Russia.

A number of telegrams to this effect were sent to Russia, while steps were taken through the Swiss Socialists to carry out this plan.

The telegrams sent to Russia were detained, apparently by our "Provisional Revolutionary Government" (or its supporters).

After two weeks' waiting for an answer from Russia, we decided to carry out the above-mentioned plan by ourselves (other emigrants decided to wait some time, being still unconvinced that the Provisional Government would actually fail to take measures for the passage of all emigrants). The whole matter was in the hands of the Swiss Socialist-internationalist, Fritz Platten. He concluded a carefully written agreement with the German ambassador in Switzerland. The text of this agreement will be published later. The main points are: 1. All emigrants, regardless of their opinions on the war, are allowed passage. 2. The railway car used by the emigrants has the privileges of extra-territoriality; no one has a right to enter it without Platten's permission; there shall be no control either of passports or of baggage. 3. The travellers agree to agitate in Russia that the emigrants allowed to pass Germany be exchanged for a corresponding number of Austro-Germans interned in Russia.

All the efforts of the German Social-Democratic majority to enter into communication with the travellers have been firmly repulsed by the latter. The car was accompanied by Platten all of the way. The latter had decided to go with us to Petrograd but was detained on the Russian [Finnish] border (Torneo)—let us hope, only temporarily. All negotiations were conducted with the participation of and in complete accord with a number of foreign Socialist-internationalists. The log of the journey was signed by two French Socialists, Loriot and Guilbeaux, and by a Socialist from the Liebknecht group (Hartstein), by the Swiss Socialist Platten, the Polish Social-Democrat Bronski, the Swiss Social-Democratic deputies, Lindhagen, Carlson, Ström, Ture Nerman and others.

"Were Karl Liebknecht in Russia now, Miliukov would permit him to go to Germany; the Bethmann-Hollwegs permit you, Russian internationalists, to pass into Russia. It is for you to go to Russia and fight there against both German and Russian imperialism." This is what our internationalist comrades told us. We think they were right. We shall present a report of the journey to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. We hope that the latter will obtain the release of a corresponding number of interned Germans, in the first place of the prominent Austrian Socialist, Otto Bauer, and that it will obtain a permit for all emigrants, not only the social-patriots, to return to Russia. We

hope that the Executive Committee will put an end to the unheard-of state of affairs, where no papers to the left of the *Riech*⁸⁴ are permitted to leave Russia, and even the Manifesto of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies⁸⁵ to the workers of the world, is not permitted to get into the foreign press.

Pravda, No. 24, April 18, 1917.

SPEECH DEALING WITH THE QUESTION OF THE JOURNEY
THROUGH GERMANY, DELIVERED AT THE SESSION OF
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PETRO-
GRAD SOVIET ON APRIL 17, 1917

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES

IN order to put a stop to the lies spread by the bourgeois press, it is necessary that the resolution offered by Comrade Zinoviev be adopted. It proposes that emigrants of all political views be allowed to pass. We have assumed no obligations. We have merely promised that on our return we would appeal to the workers to get their co-operation in the matter of exchange. Once you recognise such an exchange as proper, you implicitly refute all the lies. Otherwise you may furnish ground for insinuation and slander. . . .

First published in *Minutes, The Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies*, 1925.

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A CAUCUS OF THE BOLSHEVIK
MEMBERS OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN CONFERENCE OF
THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS'
DEPUTIES, APRIL 17, 1917⁸⁶

NOTES OF A PARTICIPANT AT THE MEETING

I HAVE outlined a few theses which I shall supply with some commentaries. I could not, because of the lack of time, present a thorough, systematic report.

The basic question is our attitude towards the war. The basic things confronting one as he reads about Russia or observes conditions here are the triumph of defencism, the triumph of the traitors to Socialism, the deception of the masses by the bourgeoisie. What strikes one particularly is that here in Russia the situation in the Socialist movement is the same as in other countries: defencism, "saving the fatherland." The difference is that nowhere is there the degree of freedom we have. That is why the responsibility before the whole international proletariat falls on us. The new government, like the preceding one, is imperialistic, despite the promise of a republic—it is imperialistic through and through.

[THE THESES]

1. In our attitude toward the war not the slightest concession must be made to "revolutionary defencism," for under the new government of Lvov and Co., owing to the capitalist nature of this government, the war on Russia's part remains a predatory imperialist war.

The class-conscious proletariat may give its consent to a revolutionary war actually justifying revolutionary defencism, only on condition (a) that all power be transferred to the proletariat and its ally, the poorest section of the peasantry; (b) that all annexations be renounced in deeds, not merely in words; (c) that there be a complete break, in practice, with all interests of capital.

In view of the undoubtedly honesty of the mass of rank and file representatives of revolutionary defencism who accept the war only as a necessity and not as a means of conquest, in view of their being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary most thoroughly, persistently, patiently to explain to them their error, to explain the inseparable connection between capital and the imperialist war, to prove that without the overthrow of capital it is *impossible* to conclude the war with a really democratic, non-oppressive peace.

This view is to be widely propagated among the army units in the field.
Fraternisation.

Not even under the new government, which remains an imperialist government, must we permit the slightest concession to defencism in our attitude toward the war. The masses regard this thing from a practical, not a theoretical, standpoint. They say: "I want to defend the fatherland, but not to seize foreign lands." When may one consider a war as one's own? When there is a complete renunciation of annexations.

The masses approach this question not from a theoretical but from a practical viewpoint. Our mistake lies in our theoretical approach. The class-conscious proletarian may consent to a revolutionary war that actually overthrows revolutionary defencism. Before the representatives of the soldiers the matter must be put in a practical way, otherwise nothing will come of it. We are not at all pacifists. The fundamental question is: which class is waging the war? The capitalist class, tied to the banks, cannot wage any but an imperialist war. The working class can. Steklov and Chkhheidze have forgotten everything. In reading the resolution passed by the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, one is amazed that people who claim to be Socialists could pass such a resolution.

What is peculiar in Russia is the tremendously rapid transition from savage violence to most subtle deception. The basic condition is the renunciation of annexations not in words, but in deeds. The *Riech* is raging about the statement published in the *Social-Democrat*⁸⁷ that the incorporation of Courland into Russia is annexation. Annexation means the incorporation of any country distinguished by national peculiarities, every incorporation of nations against their will, regardless of whether they have a language of their own or not, as long as they feel themselves to be a distinct people. This is a prejudice of the Great-Russians, cultivated for centuries.

The war can be brought to an end only through a complete break with international capital. The war was caused not by separate individuals, but by finance capital. To break with finance capital is not a simple matter, but to end the war is not a simple matter either. To suppose that the war can be stopped at will by one side is childish and naïve . . . Zimmerwald, Kienthal . . . The duty of defending the honour of international Socialism devolves upon us more than upon anybody else. The difficulty of the approach. . . .

In view of the apparent existence of a defencist sentiment among the masses who accept the war only as a necessity and not as an

excuse for making conquests, we must explain to them, thoroughly, persistently, and patiently, that it is impossible to end the war by a non-oppressive peace, unless capital is overthrown. This idea must be broadened and developed to the widest extent. The soldiers demand a concrete answer to the question—how to end the war. But to tell the people that we can end the war solely through the good intentions of a few individuals is political charlatanism. The masses must be warned. Revolution is a difficult thing. Errors are unavoidable. Our mistake has been that we [have not exposed?] revolutionary defencism to its very roots. Revolutionary defencism is treason to Socialism. It is not enough to limit ourselves to. . . . We must admit the mistake. What is to be done? Educate. How to give . . . who do not know what Socialism is. . . . We are no charlatans. We must base ourselves only on the class-consciousness of the masses. Should we even find ourselves in the minority—so be it. It sometimes pays to forego for a while a position of leadership; one must not fear to be in the minority. When the masses declare they want no conquests, I believe them. When Guchkov and Lvov say they want no conquests—they lie. When the worker says he wants to defend his country, it is the instinct of an oppressed man that speaks in him.

2. The peculiarity of the present situation in Russia is that it represents a *transition* from the first stage of the revolution, which, because of the inadequate organisation and insufficient class-consciousness of the proletariat, led to the assumption of power by the bourgeoisie,—to its second stage which is to place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest strata of the peasantry.

This transition is characterised, on the one hand, by a maximum of legality (Russia is now the freest of all the belligerent countries of the world); on the other, by the absence of oppression of the masses, and, finally, by the trustingly ignorant attitude of the masses toward the capitalist government, the worst enemy of peace and Socialism.

This peculiar situation demands of us an ability to adapt ourselves to the specific conditions of party work amidst vast masses of the proletariat just awakened to political life.

Why have the workers not seized power? Steklov offers various alibis. That's nonsense. The point is this: the proletariat is not sufficiently class-conscious and not sufficiently organised. This we must admit; the material force is in the hands of the proletariat, but the bourgeoisie has proved to be more class-conscious and better prepared. This is a monstrous fact, but we must directly and frankly admit it, and tell the people that we have failed to

assume power because we are not class-conscious and not organised. . . . The ruin of millions of people, the death of millions. . . . The most advanced countries are perishing, hence they will be confronted by the problem. . . .

The transition from the first to the second stage—the passing of power to the proletariat and the peasantry—is characterised on the one hand by a maximum of legality (Russia at present is the freest, the most advanced country in the world)—on the other, by a trustingly ignorant attitude of the masses toward the government. Even our own Bolsheviks show confidence in the government. This can be explained only by the dazing effect of the revolution. It is the death of Socialism. You, comrades, have faith in the government. In that case our ways must part. I would rather be in the minority. One Liebknecht is worth more than 110 defencists of the Steklov and Chkheidze type. If you sympathise with Liebknecht, yet extend even one finger [to the defencists], you are betraying international Socialism. If we repudiate those people . . . then every one who is oppressed will come to us, for he will be impelled to do so by the war, there being no other escape for him.

We must talk to the people without using Latin words, but simply, intelligibly. It has a right . . . we must adapt ourselves . . . to pass, but it is necessary. Our policy will prove right in the end.

3. No support to the Provisional Government; exposure of the utter falsity of all its promises, particularly those relating to the renunciation of annexations. Unmasking, instead of admitting, the illusion-breeding “demand” that *this* government, a government of capitalists, cease being imperialistic.

The *Pravda* demands that the government renounce annexations. To demand that a government of capitalists renounce annexations is balderdash, a crying mockery at . . .

From the scientific point of view, it is the height of deception, which the entire international proletariat conducted. . . . It is high time to admit the mistake. We have had enough of felicitations and resolutions, it is time to get down to business. We must proceed with a business-like, sober . . .

4. Recognition of the fact that in most of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies our party constitutes a minority, and a small one at that, in the face of the *bloc* of all the petty-bourgeois opportunist elements, from the People's Socialists, Socialists-Revolutionists, down to the Organisation Committee (Chkheidze,

Tsereteli, etc., Steklov, etc., etc.), who have yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie and have been extending this influence to the proletariat as well.

It must be explained to the masses that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies is the only possible form of revolutionary government and that, therefore, our task is, while this government is submitting to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic, and persistent analysis of its errors and tactics, an analysis especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.

While we are in the minority, we carry on the work of criticism and of exposing errors, advocating all along the necessity of transferring the entire power of state to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the masses might learn from experience how to rid themselves of errors.

We Bolsheviks are in the habit of adopting a maximum of revolutionism. But this is not enough. We must study the situation.

The real government is the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. To think otherwise is to lapse into Anarchism. It is conceded that in the Soviet of Workers' Deputies our party is in the minority. We must make it clear to the masses that the Soviet is the only possible government, a government the kind of which, barring the Commune, the world has never seen. What if the majority in the Soviet share the defencist viewpoint? That cannot be helped. Our task under the circumstances is to engage in patient, systematic, and persistent exposure of the error of their tactics.

While we are in the minority, we carry on the work of criticism, in order to save the masses from being hoodwinked. We do not want the masses to take us at our word. We are no charlatans. We want the masses to rectify their errors by actual experience.

The proclamation of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies contains not one word manifesting class-consciousness. It is all phrases! The one thing responsible for the failure of all revolutions is the high-sounding phrase, flattery of the revolutionary people. Marxism teaches how to avoid succumbing to a revolutionary phrase, particularly in times like these, when high-sounding phrases are so much in vogue.

5. Not a parliamentary republic,—a return to it from the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would be a step backward—but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies throughout the land, from top to bottom.

Abolition of the police, the army, the bureaucracy.*

All officers to be elected and to be subject to recall at any time, their salaries not to exceed the average wage of a competent worker.

This is the lesson taught by the French Commune, a lesson forgotten by Kautsky, but taught by the workers in 1905 and 1917.

* Substituting for the standing army the universal arming of the people.

assume power because we are not class-conscious and not organised. . . . The ruin of millions of people, the death of millions. . . . The most advanced countries are perishing, hence they will be confronted by the problem. . . .

The transition from the first to the second stage—the passing of power to the proletariat and the peasantry—is characterised on the one hand by a maximum of legality (Russia at present is the freest, the most advanced country in the world)—on the other, by a trustingly ignorant attitude of the masses toward the government. Even our own Bolsheviks show confidence in the government. This can be explained only by the dazing effect of the revolution. It is the death of Socialism. You, comrades, have faith in the government. In that case our ways must part. I would rather be in the minority. One Liebknecht is worth more than 110 defencists of the Steklov and Chkheidze type. If you sympathise with Liebknecht, yet extend even one finger [to the defencists], you are betraying international Socialism. If we repudiate those people . . . then every one who is oppressed will come to us, for he will be impelled to do so by the war, there being no other escape for him.

We must talk to the people without using Latin words, but simply, intelligibly. It has a right . . . we must adapt ourselves . . . to pass, but it is necessary. Our policy will prove right in the end.

3. No support to the Provisional Government; exposure of the utter falsity of all its promises, particularly those relating to the renunciation of annexations. Unmasking, instead of admitting, the illusion-breeding “demand” that this government, a government of capitalists, cease being imperialistic.

The *Pravda* demands that the government renounce annexations. To demand that a government of capitalists renounce annexations is balderdash, a crying mockery at . . .

From the scientific point of view, it is the height of deception, which the entire international proletariat conducted. . . . It is high time to admit the mistake. We have had enough of felicitations and resolutions, it is time to get down to business. We must proceed with a business-like, sober . . .

4. Recognition of the fact that in most of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies our party constitutes a minority, and a small one at that, in the face of the *bloc* of all the petty-bourgeois opportunist elements, from the People's Socialists, Socialists-Revolutionists, down to the Organisation Committee (Chkheidze,

Tsereteli, etc., Steklov, etc., etc.), who have yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie and have been extending this influence to the proletariat as well.

It must be explained to the masses that the Soviet of Workers' Deputies is the only possible form of revolutionary government and that, therefore, our task is, while this government is submitting to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic, and persistent analysis of its errors and tactics, an analysis especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.

While we are in the minority, we carry on the work of criticism and of exposing errors, advocating all along the necessity of transferring the entire power of state to the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, so that the masses might learn from experience how to rid themselves of errors.

We Bolsheviks are in the habit of adopting a maximum of revolutionism. But this is not enough. We must study the situation.

The real government is the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. To think otherwise is to lapse into Anarchism. It is conceded that in the Soviet of Workers' Deputies our party is in the minority. We must make it clear to the masses that the Soviet is the only possible government, a government the kind of which, barring the Commune, the world has never seen. What if the majority in the Soviet share the defencist viewpoint? That cannot be helped. Our task under the circumstances is to engage in patient, systematic, and persistent exposure of the error of their tactics.

While we are in the minority, we carry on the work of criticism, in order to save the masses from being hoodwinked. We do not want the masses to take us at our word. We are no charlatans. We want the masses to rectify their errors by actual experience.

The proclamation of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies contains not one word manifesting class-consciousness. It is all phrases! The one thing responsible for the failure of all revolutions is the high-sounding phrase, flattery of the revolutionary people. Marxism teaches how to avoid succumbing to a revolutionary phrase, particularly in times like these, when high-sounding phrases are so much in vogue.

5. Not a parliamentary republic,—a return to it from the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would be a step backward—but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies throughout the land, from top to bottom.

Abolition of the police, the army, the bureaucracy.*

All officers to be elected and to be subject to recall at any time, their salaries not to exceed the average wage of a competent worker.

This is the lesson taught by the French Commune, a lesson forgotten by Kautsky, but taught by the workers in 1905 and 1917.

* Substituting for the standing army the universal arming of the people.

The experience of these years teaches us not to permit the re-establishment of the police, not to permit the re-establishment of the old army.

The programme must be changed, it has become antiquated. The Soviet of Workers' Deputies is a step towards Socialism. No police, no army, no officialdom. Convocation of the Constituent Assembly—but by whom? Resolutions are written to be filed and forgotten. I would be glad to see the Constituent Assembly convoked tomorrow, but to believe that Guchkov will convoke the Constituent Assembly is naïve. All this talk about forcing the Provisional Government to convoke the Constituent Assembly—is pure prattle, is wholesale deception. There were revolutions in the past, but the police has remained; there were revolutions in the past, but all the officials, etc., have remained. This is the reason for the failure of the revolutions. The Soviet is the only government that can convoke the Assembly. We have all embraced the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, but their meaning we have not grasped. From this form of government we are drawing back toward the International that follows at the tail of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois republic cannot settle the question [of war], for this question can be settled only on an international scale. We do not promise to liberate . . . but we say that only under this form (Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies) can this be done. No other government but that of the Soviets of Workers and Agricultural Labourers. If we talk about the Commune, they won't understand. But if we say: replace the police by a Soviet of Workers' and Agricultural Labourers' Deputies, learn how to rule, there is no one to stop us—[this they will understand].

The art of government cannot be gotten out of books. Try, make mistakes, learn how to govern.

6. In the agrarian programme, the emphasis must be shifted to the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Confiscation of all private lands.

Nationalisation of all lands in the country, and management of such lands by local Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies. A separate organisation of Soviets of Deputies of the poorest peasants. Creation of model agricultural establishments out of large estates (from one hundred to three hundred *desiatinas*,* in accordance with local and other conditions and with the estimates of local institutions) under the control of the Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies, and at public expense.

* A *desiatina* equals 2.7 acres.—*Ed.*

What is the peasantry? We do not know; there are no statistics; but we do know that it is a force.

If they take the land, be sure that they will not return it to you, nor will they ask for your consent. The axis of the programme has shifted, the centre of gravity now is the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. If the revolution is not settled by the Russian peasant, it will not be settled by the German worker.

A Tambov muzhik . . .

No payment for one desiatina, one ruble for the second, two rubles for the third. We will take the land, and the landowner will not be able to get it back.

Agriculture on a communal basis.

It is necessary to have a separate Soviet of Deputies of the poorest peasants. There is the rich muzhik, there is the agricultural labourer. Even if the latter is given land—he will not be able to build up a farm anyway. Out of the large estates we must create model farms, whose management should be on a communal basis, and looked after by the Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

There are large estates.

7. Immediate merger of all the banks in the country into one general national bank, over which the Soviet of Workers' Deputies should have control.

A bank is "a form of social accounting" (Marx). The war teaches economy; everybody knows that the banks are stealing the people's wealth. Banks are the nerve, the focus of national economy. We cannot take the banks into our own hands, but we advocate their unification under the control of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies.

8. Not the "introduction" of Socialism as an immediate task, but the immediate placing of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in control of social production and distribution of goods.

Life and the revolution make the Constituent Assembly recede into the background. Laws are important not by virtue of their being written on paper but by virtue of the kind of people that put them into practice. There is proletarian dictatorship but one does not know what to do with it. Capitalism has become state capitalism. . . . Marx had . . . that which has ripened into actuality. . . .

9. Party tasks:

- A. Immediate calling of a party convention.
- B. Changing the party programme, mainly:
 - 1. Concerning imperialism and the imperialist war.
 - 2. Concerning our attitude toward the state, and our demand for a "commune state." *
 - 3. Amending our antiquated minimum programme.
- C. Changing the name of the party. **

10. Rebuilding the International.

Taking the initiative in the creation of a revolutionary International, an International against the social-chauvinists and against the "centre." ***

To sum up.

The Soviet of Workers' Deputies has been created, it exercises a tremendous influence. Instinctively everybody sympathises with it. There is a great deal more of revolutionary thought in this institution than in all the revolutionary phrases. If the Soviet of Workers' Deputies proves able to take the reins of government into its own hands—the cause of freedom is assured. Even if you write the most ideal laws—who will execute them? The same officials, but these are connected with the bourgeoisie.

We must not say to the masses "introduce Socialism," but carry out [?] . . . Capitalism has advanced; military capitalism during the war period is not the same as it was before the war.

Having drawn tactical conclusions, one must turn to practical measures. It is necessary to call a party convention immediately, it is necessary to revise the programme. Much in it is antiquated. It is necessary to change the minimum programme.

In my own name I propose that the name of the party be changed, that it be called the Communist Party. The name "Communist" will be understood by the people. The majority of the official Social-Democrats have betrayed Socialism . . . Liebknecht is the only Social-Democrat. . . . You fear to break faith with old memories. But in order to change one's linen, one must take

* A state the model for which was given by the Paris Commune.

** Instead of "Social-Democracy," whose official leaders throughout the world have betrayed Socialism, by going over to the bourgeoisie (defencists and vacillating Kautskians), we must call ourselves the *Communist Party*.

*** The "centre" in the international Social-Democracy is the tendency vacillating between chauvinists ("defencists") and internationalists, i. e., Kautsky and Co. in Germany, Longuet and Co. in France, Chkheidze and Co. in Russia, Turati and Co. in Italy, MacDonald and Co. in England, etc.

off the soiled and put on clean. Why reject the experience gained in the world struggle? The majority of the Social-Democrats all over the world have betrayed Socialism and have gone over to the side of their governments (Plekhanov, Scheidemann, Guesde). What must we do to make Scheidemann agree? . . . This point of view is destructive to Socialism. To send a radio message to Scheidemann demanding the cessation of war is a delusion.

The name Social-Democrat is inaccurate. Do not stick to an old name that has decayed through and through. Have the will to build a new party . . . and all those who are oppressed will join you.

In Zimmerwald and Kienthal the centre was transformed. . . . The *Rabochaia Gazeta*.⁸⁸ We shall prove to you that experience has shown. . . . We declare that we have formed a left wing and have broken with the centre. You either have in mind the International, and in that case must apply . . . or you . . .

The left Zimmerwald movement exists in all countries of the world. The masses must realise that Socialism has been split throughout the world. The defencists are abandoning Socialism. Only Liebknecht. . . . The future is his.

I hear that in Russia there is a movement towards unity, unity with the defencists. This is a betrayal of Socialism. I think that it is better to stand alone, like Liebknecht: one against one hundred and ten.*

First published in *Pravda*, No. 255, November 7, 1924.

* Reference is made to Liebknecht's vote against the war budget in spite of the 110 other Socialist Deputies in the Reichstag voting for it.—Ed.

TWO WORLDS

CAPITALIST newspapers like the *Riech* and the *Novoie Vremia*⁸⁹ have published articles attacking our passage through Germany and vaguely insinuating that the newly arrived are aiding the German imperialists.*

The *Izvestia*⁹⁰ of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies reprints in full the report published in yesterday's *Pravda* and presented on the *very first day* before the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. In addition to the report,** the *Izvestia* publishes the decision of the Executive Committee. The decision is published in the *Izvestia* by the editors as follows:

Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to apply immediately to the Provisional Government and to take measures looking toward the immediate admission into Russia of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude toward the war. The results of the negotiations with the government will be published in the near future.—Editors.

Here you have a small—a very small, but very characteristic—picture of two worlds. On the one hand, the world of the capitalists, the *Riech*, the *Russkaia Volia*,⁹¹ the *Novoie Vremia*, vile hints, contemptible insinuations against the Socialists; on the other hand, the world of the revolutionary democracy, of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, who in a quiet, consistent, and dignified manner have decided to "adopt measures." Measures leading to what? Measures leading to what was *not* done by the Provisional Government!

Is this not equivalent to a reprimand of the Provisional Government?

And is not this reprimand justified?

Observe that the members of the Executive Committee passed

* The famous—rather notorious—*Russkaia Volia* in its article against us offers "material" fully in the spirit of the *Riech*. Won't Messrs. Miliukov and Co. be ashamed of such a neighbour?

** Will the *Riech* dare to publish it?

their resolution, though they were fully aware that *politically* the Bolsheviks disagreed with them. For capitalists this would be a pretext for insinuation. Human dignity is something one need not look for in the world of capitalists.

Pravda, No. 25, April 19, 1917.

ON THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE PRESENT REVOLUTION

As I only arrived in Petrograd on the night of April 16, I could, of course, only on my own responsibility and admittedly without sufficient preparation render a report on April 17 on the problems of the revolutionary proletariat.

The only thing I could do to facilitate matters for myself and for honest opponents was to prepare written theses. I read them, and gave the text to Comrade Tsereteli. I read them twice, very slowly: First at the meeting of the Bolsheviks, then at the joint meeting of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

I am publishing these personal theses, provided with very short explanatory notes, which were developed in more detail in the report:

THESES

1. In our attitude toward the war not the smallest concession must be made to "revolutionary defencism," for under the new government of Lvov and Co., owing to the capitalist nature of this government, the war on Russia's part remains a predatory imperialist war.

The class-conscious proletariat may give its consent to a revolutionary war, actually justifying revolutionary defencism, only on condition (a) that all power be transferred to the proletariat and its ally, the poorest section of the peasantry; (b) that all annexations be renounced in deeds, not merely in words; (c) that there be a complete break, in practice, with all interests of capital.

In view of the undoubtedly honesty of the mass of rank and file representatives of revolutionary defencism who accept the war only as a necessity and not as a means of conquest, in view of their being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary most thoroughly, persistently, patiently to explain to them their error, to explain the inseparable connection between capital and the imperialist war, to prove that without the overthrow of capital, it is *impossible* to conclude the war with a really democratic, non-oppressive peace.

This view is to be widely propagated among the army units in the field.

Fraternisation.

2. The peculiarity of the present situation in Russia is that it represents a *transition* from the first stage of the revolution, which, because of the inadequate organisation and insufficient class-consciousness of the proletariat, led to the assumption of power by the bourgeoisie—to its second stage which is to place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest strata of the peasantry.

This transition is characterised, on the one hand, by a maximum of legality (Russia is now the freest of all the belligerent countries of the world); on the other, by the absence of oppression of the masses, and, finally, by the trustingly ignorant attitude of the masses toward the capitalist government, the worst enemy of peace and Socialism.

This peculiar situation demands of us an ability to adapt ourselves to specific conditions of party work amidst vast masses of the proletariat just awakened to political life.

3. No support to the Provisional Government; exposure of the utter falsity of all its promises, particularly those relating to the renunciation of annexations. Unmasking, instead of admitting, the illusion-breeding “demand” that *this* government, a government of capitalists, cease being imperialistic.

4. Recognition of the fact that in most of the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies our party constitutes a minority, and a small one at that, in the face of the *bloc* of all the petty-bourgeois opportunist elements from the People’s Socialists, the Socialists-Revolutionists down to the Organisation Committee (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc., Steklov, etc., etc.) who have yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie and have been extending this influence to the proletariat as well.

It must be explained to the masses that the Soviet of Workers’ Deputies is the only possible form of revolutionary government and, therefore, our task is, while this government is submitting to the influence of the bourgeoisie, to present a patient, systematic, and persistent analysis of its errors and tactics, an analysis especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.

While we are in the minority, we carry on the work of criticism and of exposing errors, advocating all along the necessity of transferring the entire power of state to the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies,

so that the masses might learn from experience how to rid themselves of errors.

5. Not a parliamentary republic—a return to it from the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would be a step backward—but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies, throughout the land, from top to bottom.

Abolition of the police, the army, the bureaucracy.*

All officers to be elected and to be subject to recall at any time, their salaries not to exceed the average wage of a competent worker.

6. In the agrarian programme, the emphasis must be shifted to the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Confiscation of all private lands.

Nationalisation of all lands in the country, and management of such lands by local Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' and Peasants' Deputies. A separate organisation of Soviets of Deputies of the poorest peasants. Creation of model agricultural establishments out of large estates (from 100 to 300 desiatinas, in accordance with local and other conditions and with the estimates of local institutions) under the control of the Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies, and at public expense.

7. Immediate merger of all the banks in the country into one general national bank, over which the Soviet of Workers' Deputies should have control.

8. Not the "introduction" of Socialism as an immediate task, but the immediate placing of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in control of social production and distribution of goods.

9. Party tasks:

A. Immediate calling of a party convention.

B. Changing the party programme, mainly:

(1) Concerning imperialism and the imperialist war.

(2) Concerning our attitude toward the state and our demand for a "commune state." ** *

(3) Amending our antiquated minimum programme.

C. Changing the name of the party. ***

10. Rebuilding the International.

* Substituting for the standing army the universal arming of the people.

** A state the model for which was given by the Paris Commune.

*** Instead of "Social-Democracy," whose official leaders throughout the world have betrayed Socialism by going over to the bourgeoisie (defencists and vacillating Kautskians), we must call ourselves the *Communist Party*.

Taking the initiative in the creation of a revolutionary International, an International against the social-chauvinists and against the “centre.” *

In order that the reader may understand why I was compelled especially to emphasise, as a rare exception, the “case” of a conscientious opponent, I would ask him to compare the above theses with the following objection of Mr. Goldenberg: Lenin, he said, “has planted the banner of civil war in the midst of revolutionary democracy” (quoted in Mr. Plekhanov’s *Yedinstvo*,⁹² No. 5).

Is this not a gem?

I write, read, and ruminate:

“In view of the undoubted honesty of the mass of rank and file representatives of ‘revolutionary defencism’ who accept the war only as a necessity and not as a means of conquest, in view of their being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary most thoroughly, persistently, patiently to explain to them their error.”

The gentlemen of the bourgeoisie, however, who call themselves Social-Democrats, who belong neither to the masses nor to the rank and file representatives of defencism, have the insolence to present my views in such words: “Has planted (!) the banner (!) of civil war (of which there is not a word in the theses nor in my speech) in the midst (!!!) of revolutionary democracy . . .”

What is it? How does this differ from pogrom propaganda? From the *Russkaia Volia*?

I write, read, and ruminate:

“The Soviet of Workers’ Deputies is the only possible form of revolutionary government, and therefore, our task is . . . to present a patient, systematic, and persistent analysis of its errors and tactics, an analysis especially adapted to the practical needs of the masses.”

But opponents of a certain calibre present my views as a call to “civil war in the midst of revolutionary democracy”!!

I attacked the Provisional Government because it has not fixed a date for convoking the Constituent Assembly either in the near future or at any time at all, confining itself to vague promises. I proved that without the Soviets of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies,

* The “centre” in the international Social-Democracy is the tendency vacillating between chauvinists (“defencists”) and internationalists, i. e., Kautsky and Co. in Germany, Longuet and Co. in France, Chkhheidze and Co. in Russia, Turati and Co. in Italy, MacDonald and Co. in England, etc.

the convocation of the Constituent Assembly is not guaranteed and its success impossible.

A view is attributed to me that I am opposed to the speediest convocation of the Constituent Assembly!!!

I would call these expressions "delirious," had not dozens of years of political fighting taught me to regard honesty in opponents as a rare exception.

In his paper Mr. Plekhanov called my speech "delirious." Very good, Mr. Plekhanov! But how awkward, uncouth, and slow-witted you are in your polemics! If I talked delirious stuff for two whole hours, why did an audience of hundreds tolerate this "delirium"? Further, why does your paper devote a whole column to reproducing this "delirium"? You have indeed made a bad shot in this matter!

It is, of course, much easier to shout, to scold, to rave than to make an attempt to relate, to explain, to recall how Marx and Engels in 1871, 1872, and 1875 viewed the experience of the Paris Commune and the kind of state the proletariat needs.

The former Marxist, Mr. Plekhanov, probably does not wish to think about Marxism.

I quoted the words of Rosa Luxemburg who, on August 4, 1914,⁹³ called the German Social-Democracy a "stinking corpse." Messrs. Plekhanov, Goldenberg and Co., however, feel "offended" . . . for whom?—for the German chauvinists who have been called chauvinists!

They have lost their way, these poor Russian social-chauvinists, Socialists in words and chauvinists in deeds.

N. LENIN.

Pravda, No. 26, April 20, 1917.

IN LOUIS BLANC'S FOOTSTEPS

THE French Socialist, Louis Blanc, gained deplorable fame in the revolution of 1848, by changing from the position of the class struggle to the position of petty-bourgeois illusions, adorned with would-be "Socialist" phraseology, but in reality tending to strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. Louis Blanc expected to receive aid from the bourgeoisie; he hoped, and aroused hopes in others, that the bourgeoisie could aid the workers in the matter of "organisation of labour"—this vague term having been supposed to express a "Socialist" tendency.

The policy of Louis Blanc has now gained the upper hand in the right wing "Social-Democracy," in the party of the O. C. in Russia. Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, and many others, who are now leaders of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies—they also were the leaders of the recently held All-Russian Conference of Soviets³⁴—have assumed precisely the position of Louis Blanc.

In all major questions of the political life of our day, these leaders, who occupy approximately the position of the international centrist tendency represented by Kautsky, Longuet, Turati, and many others, have embraced the petty-bourgeois views of Louis Blanc. Take, for instance, the war question.

The proletarian standpoint in this matter consists of a definite *class* characterisation of the war, and of an irreconcilable hostility to the imperialist war—that is, to a war waged between groups of capitalist countries (no matter whether monarchies or republics) for a division of capitalist spoils.

The petty-bourgeois viewpoint differs from the bourgeois one (outright justification of the war, outright "national defence," *i. e.*, a defence of the "interests" of the home capitalists, defence of their "right" to annexations) in that the petty bourgeois renounces annexations, "condemns" imperialism, "demands" from the bourgeoisie to cease being imperialistic while remaining within the framework of world-imperialist relations and the capitalist structure of society. Limiting himself to this innocuous, shallow, empty declamation, the

petty-bourgeois, in practice, trails helplessly behind the bourgeoisie, "sympathising" somewhat with the proletariat in words, remaining completely dependent on the bourgeoisie in fact, unable or perhaps unwilling to understand the revolutionary path that leads to the throwing off of the capitalist yoke, the only path that can save humanity from imperialism.

To "demand" from the bourgeois governments that they make a "solemn declaration" in the spirit of renouncing annexations—this seems to the petty-bourgeois to be the height of audacity as well as an example of anti-imperialist "Zimmerwaldian" consistency. It is not difficult to see that this is the policy of Louis Blanc at its worst. First of all, the competent bourgeois politician never has any difficulty in making any number of "splendid," impressive, and sonorous phrases against annexations "in general," while saying nothing and binding himself to nothing. When it comes to action, however, it is always possible to use a trick the way the bourgeois *Riech* did when it had the sad courage to declare that Courland (now annexed by the imperialist robbers of bourgeois Germany) was not annexed by Russia!

This is the most revolting trickery, the most shameless deception of the workers by the bourgeoisie, for any man who has even the most rudimentary political education must recognise that Courland *has always been annexed to Russia*.

We challenge the *Riech* directly and openly: (1) To present to the people such a political definition of the concept "annexation" that would be equally applicable to all annexations in the world, German, English, Russian, past and present, all without exception; (2) to state clearly and definitely what, in its opinion, is meant by *renunciation of annexations*, not in words, but in deeds. Let it give such a political definition of the concept "renunciation of annexations in deed" as will apply not only to the Germans, but also to the English and the other peoples that have ever perpetrated annexations.

We maintain that the *Riech* will either decline to accept our challenge or it will be exposed by us before the whole people. And it is precisely because of this question of Courland touched upon by the *Riech* that our disagreement is not theoretical but practical, most urgent, most fundamental, most timely.

Second, let us assume, if only for a moment, that the bourgeois

Ministers are models of honesty, that the Guchkovs, Lvovs, Miliukovs and Co. sincerely believe in the possibility of renouncing annexations, while preserving capitalism, and that they really *want* to renounce them.

Let us, for a moment, assume even this, let us make this Louis Blanc admission.

The question is: Can a grown-up person be content with what people think of themselves, without comparing it with what they do? Is it possible for a Marxist not to distinguish between good wishes and declarations, on the one hand, and objective reality, on the other?

No. It is not.

Annexations are maintained by the bonds of finance capital, banking capital, imperialist capital. Herein is the modern, the economic foundation of annexations. From this angle, annexations are politically guaranteed profits on billions of capital "invested" in thousands upon thousands of enterprises in the annexed countries.

It is impossible, even if one wishes to do so, to renounce annexations without taking decisive steps toward throwing off the yoke of capitalism.

Does that mean, as the *Yedinstvo*, the *Rabochaia Gazeta*, and the other "Louis Blancs" of our petty-bourgeoisie are ready to conclude and actually conclude, that we must *not* take any decisive steps toward overthrowing capital, that we must accept at least a modicum of annexations?

No. One must take decisive steps towards the overthrow of capital. One must take them efficiently and gradually, basing oneself solely on the class-consciousness and organised activity of the overwhelming majority of the workers and poorest peasants. But take them one must. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies in a number of Russian localities have already started to take them.

The order of the day now is a decisive and irrevocable parting of the ways with the Louis Blancs—Chkheidzes, Tseretelis, Steklovs, the party of the O. C., the Socialists-Revolutionists, etc., etc. One must explain to the masses that the policy of Louis Blanc destroys and will destroy the further success of the revolution, even the success of freedom, unless the masses understand the danger of those petty-bourgeois illusions and join the class-conscious workers

in their cautious, gradual, well-planned, yet firm and direct steps toward Socialism.

Outside of Socialism there is no deliverance of humanity from wars, from hunger, from the destruction of millions and millions of human beings.

N. LENIN.

Pravda, No. 27, April 21, 1917.

ON DUAL POWER

THE basic question in any revolution is that of state power. Unless this is understood, there can be no intelligent participation in the revolution, let alone direction of it.

What has made our revolution so strikingly unique, is that it has established dual power. This fact must be grasped first. Unless it be understood, there can be no further advance. We ought to be able, for example, to amend and supplement our old Bolshevik "formulae." They have proved sound in general, but their concrete realisation was quite another thing. Nobody did or could think of dual power before.

What constitutes dual power? The fact that by the side of the Provisional Government, the government of the *bourgeoisie*, there has developed *another*, as yet weak, embryonic, but undoubtedly real and growing government—the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

What is the class composition of that other government? The proletariat and the peasantry (clad in army uniforms). What is the political nature of that government? It is a revolutionary dictatorship, *i.e.*, it is a power based not on laws made by a centralised state power, but on outright revolutionary seizure, on the direct initiative of the masses from below. It is a power quite different from that of the ordinary type of parliamentary bourgeois-democratic republic that is still prevalent in the advanced countries of Europe and America. This circumstance is often forgotten, often ignored, yet it is a basic circumstance. This power is of the type of the Paris Commune of 1871. The fundamental characteristics of this kind of power are: (1) Its origin is not in a law previously considered and passed by Parliament, but in the direct initiative of the masses from below, everywhere; in outright "seizure," to use a popular expression; (2) instead of the police and the army, institutions separated from the people and opposed to the people, there is the direct arming of the whole people; orderly government is thus insured by the armed workers and peasants themselves, by the armed people itself; (3) officials, bureaucrats are also either displaced by the direct rule of the people, or at any rate, placed under special control; they not only become officers elected by the people,

but they also become subject to recall at the initiative of the people; they are reduced to the position of plain representatives; from a privileged social stratum, occupying snug, highly remunerative "berths," they change into workers skilled in handling certain "tools," receiving salaries not exceeding those of average skilled workers.

It is this and only this that makes the Paris Commune a special type of state. This truth has been forgotten and perverted by the Plekhanovs (out-and-out chauvinists, betrayers of Marxism), the Kautskys (those of the "centre," i.e., those who vacillate between chauvinism and Marxism) and all those Social-Democrats, Social-Revolutionists, etc., etc., who are now in control.

All those people confine themselves to pretty phrases, evasions, tricks; they congratulate each other a thousand times upon the revolution, but they refuse to consider the meaning of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. They refuse to see the obvious truth that *in so far as* the Soviets exist, in so far as they are a power, so far does Russia have a state of the type of the Paris Commune.

I have underscored "*in so far as*." For the Soviet power is only at its inception. By direct agreements with the bourgeois Provisional Government and by a series of actual concessions to the latter, the Soviet power has surrendered and is surrendering its position to the bourgeoisie.

Why? Is it because Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov and Co. are making a "mistake"? Nonsense. Only a philistine can think so, not a Marxist. The reason is in the lack of organisation and class consciousness among the workers and peasants. The "mistake" of the above-mentioned leaders is, simply, their petty-bourgeois position, is the fact that instead of clarifying the minds of the workers, they becloud them; instead of refusing petty-bourgeois illusions, they instill them; instead of freeing the masses from petty-bourgeois influences, they strengthen them.

Hence it should be also clear why so many mistakes are made by our comrades when they ask a "simple" question as to whether or not the Provisional Government should be overthrown.

My answer is (1) that it should be overthrown, for it is an oligarchical, bourgeois, and not a people's government, and it can give neither peace, nor bread, nor complete freedom; (2) that it cannot be overthrown now, for it is held by a direct and indirect,

by a formal and factual agreement with the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, particularly with the most important of them, the Petrograd Soviet; (3) that, generally speaking, it cannot be "overthrown" by any ordinary method, for it rests on the "support" given to the bourgeoisie by the *second* government,—the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, which is the only possible revolutionary government directly expressing the mind and the will of the majority of workers and peasants. Humanity has not yet evolved, and we do not as yet know, a type of government superior to and better than the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Workers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Deputies.

To become a power, the class-conscious workers must win the majority over to their side. So long as no violence is committed against the masses, there is no other road to power. We are not Blanquists, we are not for the seizure of power by a minority. We are Marxists, and we stand for a proletarian class-struggle against petty-bourgeois poison, against chauvinism-defencism, against empty phrases, against dependence on the bourgeoisie.

Let us create a proletarian Communist party; its elements have already been created by the best adherents of Bolshevism; let us close our ranks and carry on proletarian class work; then from among the proletarians, from among the poorer peasants ever greater numbers will come to our side. For day by day life will shatter the petty-bourgeois illusions of the "Social-Democrats"—Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, etc., of the "Socialists-Revolutionists," of the petty-bourgeois of still "purer" water, etc., etc.

The bourgeoisie stands for the exclusive power of the bourgeoisie.

The class-conscious workers stand for the exclusive power of the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Workers', Peasants', and Soldiers' Deputies; they stand for a single power, made possible not by dubious adventures, but by the crystallisation of proletarian class-consciousness, by the emancipation of the proletariat from bourgeois influence.

The petty bourgeoisie—"Social-Democrats," "Socialists-Revolutionists," etc., etc.—is vacillating, and thus hindering such crystallisation and emancipation.

This is the actual correlation of class forces determining our tasks.

N. LENIN.

LETTERS ON TACTICS

FOREWORD

ON April 17, 1917, I was called upon to report on the subject indicated in the title, first, at a meeting of Bolsheviks in Petrograd. These were delegates to the All-Russian Conference of Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets, who had to leave for their homes and could not allow me to postpone it. At the close of the meeting, the chairman, Comrade G. Zinoviev, suggested in the name of the whole assembly that I repeat my report at the joint meeting of Bolshevik and Menshevik delegates, who wished to consider the question of unifying the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party.

Difficult though it was for me immediately to repeat my report, I felt that I had no right to decline once it was demanded by comrades of my persuasion as well as by the Mensheviks, who, because of their impending departure, really could not grant me a respite.

In giving my report, I read the theses which were published in No. 26 of the *Pravda*, on April 20.*

Both the theses and my report created discord among the Bolsheviks themselves and the staff of the *Pravda*. After a number of consultations, we unanimously concluded that it would be expedient openly to discuss our differences, thus providing material for the All-Russian Conference of our party (the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, united under the Central Committee) which is to meet in Petrograd on May 3.

Complying with this decision concerning a discussion, I am publishing the following letters in which I do not pretend to have made an exhaustive study of the question, but wish only to outline the principal arguments, especially those essential for the *practical* tasks of the working-class movement.

FIRST LETTER

AN ESTIMATE OF THE PRESENT SITUATION

Marxism demands of us a most exact, an objectively verifiable analysis of the interrelations of classes and of the concrete pe-

* See pp. 106-108 of this book.—*Ed.*

culiarities of each historic moment. We Bolsheviks have always tried to be true to this demand, which is absolutely imperative from the standpoint of giving a scientific foundation to politics.

"Our doctrine is not a dogma, but a guide to action," said Marx and Engels, who always scorned the mere acquisition and repetition of "formulæ," capable at best only of outlining *general* tasks, which are necessarily changed by the concrete economic and political circumstances of each particular period in the historical process.

What, then, are the clearly established objective facts by which the party of the revolutionary proletariat must be guided now in defining the tasks and forms of its activity?

In my first "Letter from Afar" ("The First Stage of the First Revolution") which was published in Nos. 14 and 15 of the *Pravda*, April 3 and 4, 1917,* and in my theses, I define the "peculiarity of the present moment" in Russia as a period of transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second. I therefore considered the basic slogan, the "order of the day" at that time to be: "Workers, you have displayed marvels of proletarian and popular heroism in the civil war against tsarism; you must display marvels of proletarian and nation-wide organisation in order to prepare your victory in the second stage of the revolution" (*Pravda*, No. 15).

What, then, is the first stage?

It is the passing of state power to the bourgeoisie.

Before the March revolution of 1917, state power in Russia was in the hands of one old class, namely, the feudal noble landlord class, headed by Nicholas Romanov.

After that revolution, state power is in the hands of another class, a new one, namely, the *bourgeoisie*.

The passing of state power from one class to another is the first, the main, the basic principle of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of that term.

To that extent, the bourgeois, or the bourgeois-democratic, revolution in Russia is *completed*.

But at this point we hear the noise of objectors, who readily call themselves "old Bolsheviks": Haven't we always maintained, they say, that a bourgeois-democratic revolution is culminated only in a "revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry"? Is the agrarian revolution, which is a phase of the bour-

* See p. 34 of this book.—Ed.

geois-democratic revolution, completed? On the contrary, is it not a fact that it has not yet begun?

My answer is: The Bolshevik slogans and ideas have been generally confirmed by history; but as to the concrete situation, things have turned out to be different, more original, more unique, more multicoloured than could have been anticipated by any one.

To ignore, to forget, this fact would mean to resemble those "old Bolsheviks" who more than once have played a sorry part in the history of our party when they repeated a formula, once acquired, without thinking, instead of studying the peculiarities of new living reality.

"The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" has already become a reality * in the Russian Revolution, for this "formula" foresees only the interrelation of classes, but it does not foresee the concrete political institutions which realise this interrelation, this co-operation. "The Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies"—here you have "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" already realised in life.

This formula has become antiquated. Life brought it out of the realm of formulæ into the realm of reality, clothed it with flesh and blood, concretised it and thus changed it.

There is a new, a different task before us now: the split *within* this dictatorship between the proletarian elements (the anti-defencist, internationalist, "communist" elements who stand for the transition to the commune) and the petty-proprietor or petty-bourgeois elements (Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, the Socialists-Revolutionists and other revolutionary defencists, opponents of the movement toward the commune, adherents of "supporting" the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois government).

He who *now* speaks of "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" only, is behind the times, is therefore in practice on the side of the petty bourgeoisie and against the proletarian class struggle; such a one should be placed in the archive of "Bolshevik" pre-revolutionary antiques (it may be called the archive of "old Bolsheviks").

Revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry has already been realised, but in a very original way, with a number of extremely important modifications. I will deal with them separately, in one of the forthcoming letters. Now, however,

* In a certain form and to a certain extent.

it is necessary to acquire that incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognisance of living life, of the true facts of reality, that he must not continue clinging to the theory of yesterday, which, like every theory, at best only outlines the main and the general, only approximately embracing the complexity of life.

"Theory, my friend, is grey, but green is the eternal tree of life."

Whoever questions the "completeness" of the bourgeois revolution from the old viewpoint, sacrifices living Marxism to a dead letter.

According to the old conception, the rule of the proletariat and peasantry, their dictatorship, can and must follow the rule of the bourgeoisie.

In real life, however, things have already turned out otherwise; an extremely original, new, unprecedented interlocking of one and the other has taken place. Side by side, together and simultaneously, we have both the rule of the bourgeoisie (the government of Lvov and Guchkov) and the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, which *voluntarily* cedes power to the bourgeoisie and voluntarily makes itself an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

For it must not be forgotten that in Petrograd the power is actually in the hands of the workers and soldiers; the new government does not use violence against them, and cannot do so, because there is no police, there is no army separated from the people, there is no all-powerful officialdom placed above the people. This is a fact. It is the kind of fact that characterises a state of the type of the Paris Commune. This fact does not fit into the old framework of thought. One ought to be able to adapt the framework to life, rather than repeat the now senseless words about "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" *in general*.

Let us approach the question from another angle, in order to throw more light on it.

A Marxist must not leave the firm ground of the analysis of class relations. Power is in the hands of the bourgeoisie. But how about the mass of the peasants? Does it not *also* form a bourgeoisie, only of a different social stratum, of a different kind, of a different character? Wherefrom does it follow that *this* stratum cannot come into power, thus "completing" the bourgeois-democratic revolution? Why should this be impossible?

This is how the old Bolsheviks often argue.

My reply is that it is fully possible. But, in analysing a given

situation, a Marxist must proceed not from the possible, but from the real.

Reality, however, shows us that the freely elected Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies freely enter the second, the parallel government, freely supplementing, developing and completing it. And just as freely do they *give away* their power to the bourgeoisie, which phenomenon does not in the least "undermine" the theory of Marxism, for we have always known and have repeatedly pointed out that the bourgeoisie maintains itself not only by force but also by the lack of class-consciousness, the clinging to old habits, the timidity, the lack of organisation on the part of the masses.

Now, in the face of this reality of to-day, it would be simply ridiculous to turn away from the fact and to speak of "possibilities."

It is possible that the peasantry might seize all the land and all the power. Not only do I not forget this possibility, not only do I not confine myself to the present, but I definitely and clearly formulate the agrarian programme considering the new phenomenon, *i.e.*, the deep chasm between the agricultural labourers and the poorest peasants on the one hand and the peasant landowners on the other hand.

Something else is possible, however; it is possible that the peasants will listen to the advice of the petty-bourgeois party of the Socialists-Revolutionists that has yielded to the influence of the bourgeoisie, that has gone over to defencism and that advises waiting for the Constituent Assembly, although not even the date of its convocation has so far been set.*

It is possible that the peasants will adhere to and prolong their pact with the bourgeoisie, which they have concluded now through the medium of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, not only in form, but in deed.

Many things are possible. It would be the greatest mistake were we to forget the agrarian movement and the agrarian programme. But it would be equally wrong to forget the reality which shows us the fact of an agreement—or, to use a more exact, less legal, and

* Lest my words be misinterpreted, I will anticipate at once: I am absolutely in favour of the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers and Peasants immediately taking possession of all the land, on condition that they themselves should preserve the strictest order and discipline, not permitting the least injury to machines, buildings, and live stock, in no way disorganising agriculture and the production of bread stuffs, but increasing them, for the soldiers need twice as much bread, and the people must not starve.

more economic, class expression—the fact of *class collaboration* between the bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

When this fact ceases to be a fact, when the peasantry has separated itself from the bourgeoisie, when it has seized the land and power against the bourgeoisie—then there will be a new stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; and of that it will be necessary to speak separately.

A Marxist who, in view of the possibility of such a future stage, were to forget his duty at the present time when the peasantry is in agreement with the bourgeoisie, would turn petty-bourgeois. For he would in practice be preaching to the proletariat confidence in the petty bourgeoisie ("this petty bourgeoisie, this peasantry, must separate itself from the bourgeoisie within the scope of the bourgeois-democratic revolution"). This would mean that for the sake of the "possibility" of a pleasant and sweet future, in which the peasantry would not form the tail of the bourgeoisie, in which the Socialists-Revolutionists, Chkhheidze, Tsereteli and Steklov would not be an appendage of the bourgeois government,—that for the sake of the "possibility" of a pleasant future he would forget the unpleasant present in which the peasantry forms for the time being the tail of the bourgeoisie, in which the Socialists-Revolutionists and the Social-Democrats do not, for the time being, give up the rôle of an appendage of the bourgeois government, of the opposition of "His Majesty"⁹⁵ Lvov.

This hypothetical person would resemble a saccharine Louis Blanc, a sugary Kautskian, but in no way a revolutionary Marxist.

But are we not in danger of falling into subjectivism, of wanting to "skip" the bourgeois-democratic revolution—which has not yet been completed and has not gone through the peasant movement—and thus to arrive at the Socialist revolution?

This danger might threaten me, were I to say: "No Tsar, but a workers' government."⁹⁶ But I have not said this, I have said something else. I have said that there can be no other government (barring a bourgeois one) in Russia except that of the Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. I have said that, at present, power in Russia can pass from the Guchkovs and Lvovs *only* to these Soviets, in which it so happens that the majority are peasants, the majority are soldiers, the majority are petty-bourgeois, using a scientific Marxian term, using not an everyday, philistine, professional, but a class characterisation.

In my theses, I have absolutely insured myself against any skipping of the peasant and other petty-bourgeois movements which are still in existence, against any *playing* with the “conquest of power” by a workers’ government, against any kind of Blanquist adventure, for I directly referred to the experiences of the Paris Commune. This experience, as is well known, and as was pointed out by Marx in 1871 and Engels in 1891, absolutely excluded Blanquism, absolutely secured direct, immediate and absolute rule of the *majority* and the activity of the masses only to the extent of the *conscious* action of the majority.

In the theses, I most definitely reduced the question to a struggle for influence within the Soviets of Workers’, Agricultural Labourers’, Soldiers’ and Peasants’ Deputies. In order to leave no trace of a doubt in this respect, I twice emphasised in the theses the necessity of patient, persistent work of “explaining,” adapted to “the practical needs of the masses.”

Ignorant persons or renegades from Marxism, such as Mr. Plekhanov and his ilk, may clamour about Anarchism, Blanquism, etc. Any one who wants to think and learn cannot fail to understand that Blanquism is seizure of power by a minority, whereas the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies are admittedly the direct and immediate organisation of the majority of the people. Work reduced to a struggle for influence within such Soviets, cannot, really cannot, drift into the swamp of Blanquism. It cannot drift into the swamp of Anarchism either, for Anarchism is a denial of the necessity of the state and state power for the epoch of transition from the rule of the bourgeoisie to the rule of the proletariat. Whereas I advocate, with a clearness that excludes any misunderstanding, the necessity of the state for this epoch, but, in accordance with Marx and with the experience of the Paris Commune, I advocate not the usual parliamentary bourgeois state, but a state without a standing army, without a police placed in opposition to the people, without an officialdom placed above the people.

When Mr. Plekhanov, in his newspaper *Yedinstvo*, inveighs with all his might against Anarchism, he only gives further evidence of his breach with Marxism. In reply to my challenge in the *Pravda* (No. 26) that he relate what Marx and Engels taught about the state in the years 1871, 1872, 1875, Plekhanov can only answer with silence regarding the substance of the question and with a storm of abuse in the spirit of the embittered bourgeoisie.

Mr. Plekhanov, the ex-Marxist, has absolutely failed to understand the doctrine of Marxism about the state. Indeed, germs of this lack of understanding are also to be found in his German brochure on Anarchism.⁹⁷

Let us now see how Comrade L. Kamenev formulates his "disagreements" with my theses and with the above-expressed views in his short article in No. 27 of the *Pravda*. This will help us to clarify them with more exactness.

"As regards Comrade Lenin's general line," writes Comrade Kamenev, "it appears to us unacceptable, inasmuch as it proceeds from the assumption that the bourgeois-democratic revolution has been completed, and it builds on the immediate transformation of this revolution into a Socialist revolution."⁹⁸

There are two major errors in this.

1. The question of a "completed" bourgeois-democratic revolution is stated wrongly. The question is put in an abstract, simple, if we may say so, monochromatic way, which does not correspond to the objective reality. Any one who puts the question in this way, who *now* asks whether the bourgeois-democratic revolution has been completed, and nothing further, deprives himself of the possibility of seeing the extraordinarily complicated actuality which has at least two colours. This—in theory. In practice, he capitulates feebly to petty-bourgeois revolutionism.

As a matter of fact, reality shows us both the passing of the power into the hands of the bourgeoisie (a "completed" bourgeois-democratic revolution of the ordinary type) and, by the side of the actual government, the existence of a parallel government which represents the "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry." This latter "also government" has itself ceded power to the bourgeoisie, has voluntarily chained itself to the bourgeois government.

Is this reality embraced in the old Bolshevik formula of Comrade Kamenev which says that "the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed"?

No, the formula is antiquated. It does not apply. It is dead. Attempts to revive it will be in vain.

2. A practical question. Who knows whether it is possible at present for a special "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry," detached from the bourgeois govern-

ment, to exist in Russia? Marxian tactics must not be based on the unknown.

But if this is possible after all, then there is one, and only one way toward it, namely, a direct, resolute, irrevocable separation of the proletarian Communist elements from the petty-bourgeois elements.

Why?

Because the whole petty bourgeoisie has, not by chance but of necessity, turned toward chauvinism (defencism), towards "supporting" the bourgeoisie, towards depending on it, towards the fear of not getting on without it, etc.

How can the petty bourgeoisie be "pushed" into power, when this petty bourgeoisie could seize power *now*, but would not?

Only by separating the proletarian, the Communist Party, through proletarian class struggle free from the timidity of those petty-bourgeois, only by consolidating the proletarians who are free from the influence of the petty bourgeoisie in deed and not only in word—can one make things so "hot" for the petty bourgeoisie that, in certain circumstances, it will have to seize power; it is not even out of the question that Guchkov and Miliukov—again in certain circumstances—should stand for all power given solely to Chkheidze, Tsereteli, the Socialists-Revolutionists, Steklov, because after all they are all "defencists."

Any one who, right now, immediately and irrevocably, separates the proletarian elements of the Soviets (*i. e.*, the proletarian Communist Party) from the petty-bourgeois elements, provides a correct expression of the interests of the movement for either one of the two possible cases: for the case when Russia still goes through a special "dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" independently of the bourgeoisie, and for the case when the petty bourgeoisie is not able to detach itself from the bourgeoisie and swings eternally (that is until Socialism is established) between us and it.

Any one who is guided in his activities by the simple formula, "the bourgeois-democratic revolution is not completed," vouchsafes, as it were, the certainty of the petty bourgeoisie being independent of the bourgeoisie. In doing so, he at once helplessly surrenders to the petty bourgeoisie.

Apropos: With regard to the "formula" of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, I would recall that, in my article

"Two Tactics" (July, 1905) I specially emphasised (*Twelve Years*, p. 435):⁹⁹

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry has, like everything else in the world, a past and a future. Its past is absolutism, feudalism, monarchy, privileges. . . . Its future—the struggle against private property, the struggle of the wage-earners against the employers, the struggle for Socialism. . . .*

The mistake made by Comrade Kamenev is that in 1917 he only sees the past of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. In reality, however, its future has already begun, for the interests and the policy of the wage-earners and the petty proprietors have already taken different lines, and that in such an important question as "defencism," the attitude toward the imperialist war.

This brings me to the second mistake in the remarks of Comrade Kamenev quoted above: He reproaches me, saying that my line "builds" on "the immediate transformation of this (bourgeois-democratic) revolution into a Socialist revolution."

This is not true. Not only do I not "build" on the "immediate transformation" of our revolution into a Socialist one, but I actually caution against it, when in Thesis No. 8, I state: "Not the 'introduction' of Socialism as an immediate task. . . ."

Is it not clear that any one who builds on the immediate transformation of our revolution into a Socialist one could not oppose the immediate task of introducing Socialism?

More than that. It is not even possible to introduce in Russia "immediately" a "commune state" (i. e., a state organized according to the type of the Paris Commune), because for that it would be necessary that the majority of the Deputies in all (or in most) Soviets should clearly recognise the entire erroneousness and harm of the tactics and policy of the Socialists-Revolutionists, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, etc. Whereas I declared in plain language that in this respect I only build on "patient" explaining (is it necessary to be patient to bring about a change which can be realised "immediately"?).

Comrade Kamenev has made a rather "impatient" start; he has repeated the bourgeois prejudice against the Paris Commune, namely, that it wanted to introduce Socialism "immediately." This is not true. The Commune, unfortunately, hesitated too long over

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. VII.—Ed.

the introduction of Socialism. The real essence of the Commune is not where the bourgeois usually look for it, but in the creation of a state of a special type. A state of this kind has already been born in Russia, it is the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!

Comrade Kamenev has not grasped the fact, the significance of the existing Soviets, their identity, as to their socio-political character, with the Commune state; instead of studying the fact, he began to discuss what, in his opinion, I consider as the "immediate" future. The result is, unfortunately, a repetition of the method of many bourgeois: from the question as to what the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are, whether they represent a higher type than a parliamentary republic, whether they are more useful for the people, more democratic, more adapted to the struggle, for instance, against the lack of bread, etc.,—from this urgent, real question raised by life itself, attention is diverted to the empty, allegedly scientific, in reality hollow, professionally lifeless question of "building on an immediate transformation."

An idle question put in the wrong way. I "build" only on this, exclusively on this—that the workers, soldiers and peasants will deal better than the officials, better than the police, with the practical, difficult problems of increasing the production of foodstuffs, their better distribution, the more satisfactory provisioning of the soldiers, etc., etc.

I am deeply convinced that the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies will make the independent activity of the people a reality more quickly and effectively than will a parliamentary republic (I will compare the two types of state in greater detail in another letter). They will more effectively, more practically and more correctly decide what steps can be taken toward Socialism and how these steps should be taken. Control over a bank, amalgamation of all banks into one, is not yet Socialism, but it is a step toward Socialism. To-day such steps are being taken in Germany by the Junkers and the bourgeoisie against the people. To-morrow the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies will be able to take these steps more effectively to the advantage of the people when the whole state power will be in its hands.

What compels the taking of such steps?

Famine. Economic disorganisation. Imminent collapse. War horrors. Horrors of the wounds inflicted on mankind by the war.

Comrade Kamenev concludes his article with the remark that "in

a broad discussion he hopes to carry his point of view as the only possible one for revolutionary Social-Democracy in so far as it wishes to be and must remain to the very end the one and only party of the revolutionary masses of the proletariat without turning into a group of Communist propagandists."

It seems to me that these words betray a completely erroneous estimate of the situation. Comrade Kamenev contrasts a "party of the masses" with a "group of propagandists." Still, just now the "masses" have yielded to the frenzy of "revolutionary" defencism. Is it not more worthy of internationalists at this moment to be able to resist "mass" frenzy rather than to "wish to remain" with the masses, *i.e.*, to yield to the general epidemic? Have we not witnessed how in all the belligerent countries of Europe, the chauvinists justified themselves by their wish to "remain with the masses"? Is it not our duty to be able to remain for a while in the minority against a "mass" frenzy? Is not the work of the propagandists at the present moment the very central issue, since it tends to clear the proletarian line from the defencist and petty-bourgeois "mass" frenzy? It was just this fusion of the masses, proletarian and non-proletarian, without distinction of class differences inside of the masses, that formed one of the conditions for the defencist epidemic. To speak with contempt of a "group of propagandists" advocating a *proletarian* line does not seem to be very becoming.

Written in the middle of April, 1917.

First published in pamphlet form in 1917 by the "Priboi" publishing firm.

THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION

PROPOSED PLATFORM OF A PROLETARIAN PARTY

THE historical moment through which we are passing is characterised by the following fundamental traits:

THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE REVOLUTION

1. The old tsarist power, which represented only a handful of feudal landowners in command of the entire state machinery (army, police, bureaucracy) has been shattered and removed, but not entirely destroyed. The monarchy has not been formally abolished. The Romanov coterie continues monarchist plots. The vast estates of the feudal landowners have not been liquidated.

2. State power in Russia has passed into the hands of a new class, namely, the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisified landowners. To that extent the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia has been completed.

Finding itself in power, the bourgeoisie formed a bloc with openly monarchist elements which became notorious by their unusually ardent support of Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman in 1906-1914 (Guchkov and other politicians to the right of the Cadets). The new bourgeois government of Lvov and Co. has attempted to negotiate with the Romanovs concerning the restoration of the monarchy in Russia. While shouting revolutionary phrases, this government has appointed to positions of authority partisans of the old régime. Having turned over the entire state machinery (army, police, bureaucracy) to the bourgeoisie, this government strives to reform it as little as possible. The revolutionary initiative of mass action and the seizure of power by the people from below, this only assurance of a real success of the revolution, already meets with all sorts of obstacles on the part of the new government.

The government has not as yet announced the date for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. Neither does it touch the ownership of the landed estates, this material foundation of feudal tsarism. The government does not even contemplate starting an investigation of the activities, or making public the activities, or controlling the monopolistic financial organisations of the large banks, the syndicates and cartels of the capitalists, etc.

The main and decisive ministerial posts in the new government (the ministry of the interior, the war ministry, *i.e.*, the command over the army, the police, the bureaucracy and the entire machinery for the oppression of the masses) belong to notorious monarchists and adherents of the large landholding system. The Cadets, those republicans since yesterday, republicans against their will, have been given posts of secondary importance, in no way connected with authority over the people and with the machinery of state power. A. Kerensky, a representative of the Trudoviks and "also a Socialist," does literally nothing else but lull to sleep the people's watchfulness and attention with well-sounding phrases.

For all these reasons, the new bourgeois government does not deserve the proletariat's confidence even in the field of internal politics, and no support of it is admissible on the part of the workers.

THE FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE NEW GOVERNMENT

3. In the domain of foreign policy, which was placed in the forefront in consequence of objective conditions, the new government stands for the continuation of the imperialist war waged in concert with the imperialist powers, England, France, and others, for the sake of sharing capitalist spoils, for the sake of strangling small and weak peoples.

Dominated by the interests of Russian capital and its powerful protector and master, Anglo-French imperialist capital, which is the wealthiest in all the world, the new government, despite the wishes expressed most definitely in the name of a clear majority of the Russian peoples through the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, has taken no real steps whatever towards stopping the slaughter of peoples for the interests of the capitalists. It has not even published the secret treaties of a frankly predatory character (concerning the partition of Persia, the robbing of China, the robbing of Turkey, the annexation of East Prussia, the annexation of the German colonies, etc.) which, as everybody knows, bind Russia to Anglo-French imperialist and predatory capital. It has confirmed these treaties concluded by tsarism which for several centuries robbed and oppressed more peoples than did all other tyrants and despots, tsarism which not only oppressed but also disgraced and demoralised the Great-Russian people by transforming it into an executioner of other peoples.

The new government, having confirmed those shameful and

predatory treaties, has not offered to all the belligerent peoples an immediate armistice, in spite of the clearly expressed demands of a majority of the peoples of Russia voiced through the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. It has evaded the issue by resorting to solemn, sonorous, glittering but perfectly empty phrases and declarations, which have always served, and do serve, in the mouths of bourgeois diplomats to deceive the gullible and naïve masses of an oppressed people.

4. This is why the new government not only does not deserve the slightest confidence in the domain of foreign policy, but even to demand of it that it should make known the will of the peoples of Russia for peace, that it should renounce annexations, etc., would, in reality, mean to deceive the people, to awaken in them hopes that cannot be realised, to retard their intellectual enlightenment, indirectly to reconcile them to a continuation of a war of which the social character is determined not by good wishes but by the class character of the government that wages the war, by the alliance between the class represented by that government and the imperialist finance capital of Russia, England and France, etc., by that real and actual policy which that class conducts.

UNIQUE DUAL POWER AND ITS CLASS MEANING

5. The main peculiarity of our revolution, a peculiarity most urgently requiring thoughtful analysis, is dual power established during the very first days after the victory of the revolution. This dual power is expressed in the existence of two governments: one is the main, real, actual government of the bourgeoisie, the "Provisional Government" of Lvov and Co. which has in its hands all the organs of power; the other is an additional, a parallel, a "controlling" government, the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which has no organs of state power in its hands, but which is based directly on a clear majority of the people, on the armed workers and soldiers.

The class origin and the class meaning of this dual power is to be found in the fact that the March Revolution has not only swept away the entire tsarist monarchy, has not only transferred all power to the bourgeoisie, but has also come close to a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Precisely such a dictatorship (that is, power resting not on law but on the direct force of armed masses of the population) and precisely

of the above-mentioned classes is the Petrograd and other local Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

6. The second highly important feature of the Russian Revolution is the circumstance that the Petrograd Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, which obviously enjoys the confidence of most of the local Soviets, voluntarily transfers state power to the bourgeoisie and its Provisional Government, voluntarily surrenders to the latter its own supremacy after having entered into an agreement to support it, and limits itself to the rôle of a supervising body assuring the convocation of the Constituent Assembly (the date for the convocation of which has not as yet been announced by the Provisional Government).

This most peculiar situation, unparalleled in history, has led to the simultaneous existence and interlocking of two dictatorships: the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (for the Provisional Government of Lvov and Co. is a dictatorship, *i.e.*, power based not on law nor on a previously expressed will of the people, but on seizure by force, which seizure was accomplished by a definite class, namely, the bourgeoisie) and the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry (the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies).

There is not the slightest doubt but that such a combination cannot last long. There can be no two powers in a state. One of them is bound to dwindle to nothing, and the entire Russian bourgeoisie is already straining all its energies everywhere and in every possible way in an endeavour to weaken, to set aside, to reduce to nothing the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, to create one single power for the bourgeoisie.

Dual power expresses merely a transition moment in the development of the revolution, when it has gone farther than the usual bourgeois-democratic revolution, but has not yet reached a "pure" dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

The class meaning (and class explanation) of this transitional, unstable situation consists in the following: Like every other revolution, our revolution demanded the greatest heroism and self-sacrifice on the part of the masses in the struggle against tsarism, and all at once it set in motion an unusually large number of people.

One of the chief symptoms, from the point of view of science and practical politics, of every real revolution is the unusually brusque, sharp and sudden increase in the number of the average run of

people who begin to participate, actively, independently, and forcefully, in political life, in the state apparatus.

This is the case of Russia. Russia is now in a state of ebullition. Millions of people, politically asleep for ten years, politically crushed by the terrible pressure of tsarism and slave labour for landowners and manufacturers, have awakened and thrown themselves into politics. Who are these millions of people? Mostly small proprietors, petty-bourgeois, people half way between capitalists and wage workers. Russia is the most petty-bourgeois of all the European countries.

A gigantic petty-bourgeois wave has swept everything, has overwhelmed the class-conscious proletariat not only numerically but also ideologically, *i. e.*, it has infected, it has captured very wide circles of workers with the political ideals of the petty bourgeoisie.

The petty bourgeoisie, in real life, depends upon the bourgeoisie; living, as it does, not like proletarians, but like property-owners (as far as its position in social production is concerned), it also follows the bourgeoisie in its way of thinking.

An attitude of unreasoning confidence in the capitalists, the worst foes of peace and Socialism,—such is at present the attitude of the Russian masses, such is the feeling that has grown with revolutionary rapidity out of the socio-economic soil of the most petty-bourgeois country of Europe. Such is the class basis for the “agreement” existing between the Provisional Government and the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies (I emphasise that I have in mind not so much formal agreement as practical support, tacit understanding, a naïvely trustful yielding of power)—an agreement that has given to the Guchkovs a fat morsel, actual power, whereas to the Soviet it gave promises, honour (for the time being), flattery, phrases, assurances, curtsies on the part of the Kerenskys.

The insufficient numerical strength of the proletariat in Russia, its insufficient class-consciousness and organisation—this is the reverse of the same medal.

All the Narodnik parties, including the Socialists-Revolutionists, have always been petty-bourgeois. The same is true of the party of the Organisation Committee (Chkhheidze, Tsereteli, etc.); the independent revolutionists (Steklov and others) have equally drifted with the tide, at least they have not overcome it, they have had no time to overcome the tide.

THE PECULIARITY OF THE TACTICS FOLLOWING FROM
THE ABOVE

7. From the peculiarity of the actual situation indicated above follows the peculiarity of present tactics, which are obligatory for a Marxist who reckons with objective facts, with masses and classes, rather than with persons, etc.

This peculiarity makes it imperative "to pour vinegar and bile into the sweetish water of revolutionary democratic eloquence" (as a fellow member of the Central Committee, Teodorovich, expressed himself—most aptly—at yesterday's session of the All-Russian Congress of Railroad Employés and Workers in Petrograd). We must do the work of criticism, expose the mistakes of the petty-bourgeois Socialist-Revolutionist and Social-Democratic parties, prepare and weld together the elements of a class-conscious proletarian Communist Party, free the proletariat from the spell of the "common" petty-bourgeois delusion.

In appearance this is "nothing more" than propaganda work. In reality, this is the most practical revolutionary work, for a revolution cannot possibly be moved forward when it stalls, it chokes on phrases, it treads everlastinglly the same spot not because of outside obstacles, not because the bourgeoisie uses force (so far Guchkov only threatens to use force against the soldiers), but simply by the unthinking confidence of the masses.

Only by combating this unthinking confidence (and one can and must combat it only ideologically, by comradely persuasion, by reference to life's experience) can we free ourselves from the reigning bacchanalia of revolutionary phrases and make real progress in stimulating the class-consciousness of the proletariat and of the masses in general, as well as their determined initiative everywhere, their self-willed realisation, development and strengthening of liberties, democracy, and the principle of national ownership of all the land.

8. The world-wide experience of bourgeois and feudal governments has developed two methods of keeping people enslaved. The first is violence. Nicholas Romanov I, called Nicholas Palkin,* and Nicholas II, the Bloody, showed to the Russian people a maximum of what is possible and impossible in the use of this, the hangman's method. But there is another method, the one best

* From the Russian word *palka*, meaning stick, club.—*Ed.*

developed by the English and French bourgeoisie, who were “taught” by a series of great revolutions and revolutionary movements of the masses. This is the method of deception, flattery, pretty phrases, innumerable promises, cheap sops, conceding the unimportant, retaining the important.

The peculiarity of the present moment in Russia consists in a dizzyingly rapid transition from the first method to the second, from violent oppression of the people to flattery and deceitful promises. Vaska the cat listens, but continues eating.* Miliukov and Guchkov hold power, protect the profits of capital, conduct an imperialist war in the interests of Russian and Anglo-French capital, while confining themselves to promises, declamation, impressive statements in reply to the speeches of “cooks” like Chkhheidze, Tsere-teli, Steklov, who threaten, exhort, conjure, beseech, demand, declare. . . . Vaska the cat listens, but continues eating.

But from day to day the trustful thoughtlessness and thoughtless trustfulness will dwindle away, especially among the proletarians and poorest peasants, whom life (their socio-economic position) teaches to distrust the capitalists.

The leaders of the petty bourgeoisie “must” teach the people to trust the bourgeoisie. The proletarians must teach the people to distrust it.

REVOLUTIONARY DEFENCISM AND ITS CLASS MEANING

9. Revolutionary defencism must be recognised as the most imposing and striking manifestation of the petty-bourgeois wave which has overwhelmed “nearly everything.” It is, indeed, the worst enemy of the further progress and success of the Russian Revolution.

Whoever has yielded on this point and has been unable to free himself is lost to the revolution. The masses, however, yield in a way different from that of the leaders, and they free themselves also differently, by another course of development, by other means.

Revolutionary defencism is, on the one hand, the result of the deception practiced on the masses by the bourgeoisie, the result of the peasants’ and part of the workers’ unthinking confidence; and on the other, the expression of the interests and standpoint of the

* Quotation from a fable by Krylov. The cook finds the cat eating chicken; the cook uses moral suasion. The cat listens but continues eating. Vaska is the Russian pet name for a tom cat.—*Ed.*

petty proprietor, who to a certain extent is interested in annexations and bank profits, and who “religiously” guards the traditions of tsarism which demoralised the Great-Russians by doing hangman’s work among other peoples.

The bourgeoisie deceives the people by playing upon the noble pride of the revolution and by painting the situation in a manner as if the socio-political character of the war, as far as Russia is concerned, has changed with the coming of this stage of the revolution, with the substitution of the bourgeois near-republic of Guchkov and Miliukov for the Tsar’s monarchy. The people believe it,—for the time being—thanks, in a large degree, to the prejudices of old times, which cause them to see in the other peoples of Russia, outside of the Great-Russians, something like the property and the domain of the Great-Russians. The hideous demoralisation of the Great-Russian people by tsarism, which taught it to see in other peoples something inferior, something that “by right” belonged to Great-Russia, could not disappear at once.

It is required of us that we should be able to explain to the masses that the socio-political character of the war is determined not by the “good-will” of persons or groups, even peoples, but by the position of the class which conducts the war, by the class policy of which the war is a continuation, by the interrelations of capital as the dominant economic force in modern society, by the imperialist character of international capital by Russia’s financial, banking, and diplomatic dependence upon England and France, etc. To explain this to the masses, skilfully and clearly, is not easy; none of us could do that all at once without errors.

But such, and only such, should be the trend or, rather, the contents of our propaganda. The slightest concession to revolutionary defencism is treason to Socialism, is a complete abandonment of internationalism, no matter what the beautiful phrases, what the “practical” considerations by which we may justify it.

The slogan, “Down with the War,” is correct, to be sure, but it does not take into account the peculiarity of the tasks of the moment, the necessity to approach the masses in a different way. It reminds me of another slogan, “Down with the Tsar,” with which an inexperienced agitator of the “good old days” went directly and simply to the village—to be beaten up. Those from the masses who are for revolutionary defencism are sincere, not in a personal, but in a class sense, *i. e.*, they belong to such classes (workers and

poor peasants) as really gain nothing from annexations and the strangling of other peoples. They are quite different from the bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia who know very well that it is impossible to give up annexations without giving up the rule of capital, and who unscrupulously deceive the masses with beautiful phrases, with no end of promises, no end of assurances.

The average person who favours revolutionary defencism looks upon the thing in a simple matter-of-fact way: "I, for one, do not want any annexations, but the German 'presses' me hard, that means that I am defending a just cause and not any imperialist interests." To a man like this it must be explained very patiently that it is not a question of his personal wishes, but of mass, class, political relationships and conditions, of the connection between the war and the interests of capital, the war and the international network of banks, etc. Only such a struggle against defencism is serious and promises success, perhaps not very quick, but real and durable.

HOW THE WAR CAN BE ENDED

10. The war cannot be ended "at will." It cannot be ended by the decision of one side. It cannot be ended by "sticking the bayonet into the ground," to use the expression of a soldier-defencist.

The war cannot be ended by an "agreement" between the Socialists of various countries, by "demonstrations" of the proletarians of various countries, by the "will" of the peoples, etc. All such phrases, filling the articles of the defencist, semi-defencist and semi-internationalist papers, as well as the numerous resolutions, appeals, manifestos, declarations of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, all these phrases are nothing but empty, harmless, goody-goody wishes of the petty-bourgeois. There is nothing more harmful than phrases like the "manifestation of the peoples' will to peace," the sequence of revolutionary proletarian actions (after the Russian proletariat comes the German), etc. All this is in the spirit of Louis Blanc, it is sweet dreams, a game of "political campaigning," in reality a repetition of the fable about Vaska the cat.

The war was not born out of the ill-will of capitalist robbers, although it undoubtedly is fought solely in their interests and they alone get rich from it. The war was born out of half a century of development of international capital, its billions of threads and connections. One cannot jump out of an imperialist war, one cannot attain a democratic unoppressive peace without overthrowing the power of

capital, without the state power passing to a different class, the proletariat.

The Russian Revolution of March, 1917, was the beginning of the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war. The revolution took the first step towards ending the war. Only the second step can make the end of the war a certainty, namely, the passing of state power to the proletariat. This will be the beginning of a "breach in the front" on a world scale, a breach in the front of the interests of capital, and only after making this gap can the proletariat save mankind from the horrors of war and give it the blessings of a durable peace.

To such a "breach in the front" of capital the Russian Revolution has already brought the Russian proletariat by creating the Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

THE NEW TYPE OF STATE ARISING IN OUR REVOLUTION

11. The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', etc., Deputies are not understood, not only in the sense that their class character, their part in the Russian Revolution, is not clear to the majority. They are not understood also in the sense that they constitute a new form, rather, a new type of state.

The most perfect and advanced type of bourgeois state is that of a parliamentary democratic republic: power is vested in parliament; state machinery, apparatus, and organ of administration are the usual ones: a standing army, police, bureaucracy, practically unchangeable, privileged, and standing above the people.

But revolutionary epochs, beginning with the end of the nineteenth century, bring to the fore the highest type of democratic state, the kind of state which in certain respects, to quote Engels, ceases to be a state, "is no state in the proper sense of the word."¹⁰⁰ This is a state of the type of the Paris Commune, a state replacing the standing army and the police by a direct arming of the people itself. This is the essence of the Commune, which has been so much misrepresented and slandered by bourgeois writers, which, among other things, has been erroneously accused of wishing to "introduce" Socialism immediately.

This is the type of state which the Russian Revolution began to create in the years 1905 and 1917. A Republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', etc., Deputies, united in an All-Russian Constituent Assembly of the people's representatives, or in a

Soviet of Soviets, etc.—this is what is already coming into life now, at this very time, upon the initiative of millions of people who, of their own accord, are creating a democracy in their own way, without waiting until Cadet gentlemen-professors will have written drafts of laws for a parliamentary bourgeois republic, or until the pedants and routine worshippers of petty-bourgeois "Social-Democracy," like Plekhanov and Kautsky, have abandoned their distortion of the teaching of Marxism concerning the state.

Marxism differs from Anarchism in that it admits the necessity of the state and state power in a revolutionary period in general, and in the epoch of transition from capitalism to Socialism in particular.

Marxism differs from the petty-bourgeois, opportunist "Social-Democracy" of Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. in that it admits the necessity for the above-mentioned periods of a state not like the usual parliamentary bourgeois republic, but like the Paris Commune.

The main differences between the latter type of state and the bourgeois state are the following:

It is extremely easy to revert from a bourgeois republic to a monarchy (as history proves), since all the machinery of repression is left intact: army, police, bureaucracy. The Commune and the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies smash and remove that machinery.

A parliamentary bourgeois republic strangles and crushes the independent political life of the masses, their direct participation in the democratic upbuilding of all state life from top to bottom. The opposite is true about the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The latter reproduce the type of state that was being evolved by the Paris Commune and that Marx called the "finally discovered political form in which the economic liberation of the toilers can take place."¹⁰¹

The usual objection is that the Russian people is not as yet prepared for the "introduction" of a Commune. This was the argument of serf owners who claimed that the peasants were not prepared for freedom. The Commune, *i.e.*, the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, does not "introduce," does not intend to "introduce" and should not introduce any reorganisations which are not absolutely ripe both in economic reality and in the consciousness of an overwhelming majority of the people. The more terrible the economic collapse and the crisis produced by the war, the more urgent is the

need of a most perfect political form which facilitates the healing of the wounds inflicted by the war upon mankind. The less organisational experience the Russian people has, the more determinedly must we proceed with the organisational development of the people, not leaving it merely to the bourgeois politicians and bureaucrats with sinecures.

The sooner we cast off the pseudo-Marxian prejudices of Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co., the more diligently we start helping the people everywhere and immediately to organise Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies; the longer Messrs. Lvov and Co. procrastinate the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the easier will it be for the people to make (through the medium of the Constituent Assembly, or outside of it, if Lvov delays its convocation long) its decision in favour of a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. Blunders in the new organisational reconstruction by the people are inevitable at the beginning, but it is better to blunder while progressing than to wait until the professors of law called by Mr. Lvov will have written laws concerning the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the perpetuation of the parliamentary bourgeois republic and the strangulation of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies.

If we organise and conduct our propaganda efficiently, not only the proletarians but nine-tenths of the peasantry will be against the re-establishment of the police, against an irremovable and privileged bureaucracy, against an army separated from the people. This alone constitutes the new type of state.

12. The substitution of a national militia for the police is a transformation that follows from the entire course of the revolution and that is now being introduced in most localities of Russia. We must make it clear to the masses that in the majority of revolutions of the usual bourgeois type, a transformation of that sort was very ephemeral and that the bourgeoisie, however democratic and republican it may have been, soon re-established the police of the old tsarist type, a police separated from the people, commanded by bourgeois and capable of oppressing the people in every way.

There is only one way to prevent the re-establishment of the old police: to organise a national militia, to fuse it with the army (the standing army to be replaced by a general arming of the people). The militia should comprise all citizens of both sexes between the ages of fifteen and sixty-five, these age limits being selected approxi-

Soviet of Soviets, etc.—this is what is already coming into life now, at this very time, upon the initiative of millions of people who, of their own accord, are creating a democracy in their own way, without waiting until Cadet gentlemen-professors will have written drafts of laws for a parliamentary bourgeois republic, or until the pedants and routine worshippers of petty-bourgeois "Social-Democracy," like Plekhanov and Kautsky, have abandoned their distortion of the teaching of Marxism concerning the state.

Marxism differs from Anarchism in that it admits the necessity of the state and state power in a revolutionary period in general, and in the epoch of transition from capitalism to Socialism in particular.

Marxism differs from the petty-bourgeois, opportunist "Social-Democracy" of Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. in that it admits the necessity for the above-mentioned periods of a state not like the usual parliamentary bourgeois republic, but like the Paris Commune.

The main differences between the latter type of state and the bourgeois state are the following:

It is extremely easy to revert from a bourgeois republic to a monarchy (as history proves), since all the machinery of repression is left intact: army, police, bureaucracy. The Commune and the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies smash and remove that machinery.

A parliamentary bourgeois republic strangles and crushes the independent political life of the masses, their direct participation in the democratic upbuilding of all state life from top to bottom. The opposite is true about the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The latter reproduce the type of state that was being evolved by the Paris Commune and that Marx called the "finally discovered political form in which the economic liberation of the toilers can take place."¹⁰¹

The usual objection is that the Russian people is not as yet prepared for the "introduction" of a Commune. This was the argument of serf owners who claimed that the peasants were not prepared for freedom. The Commune, *i.e.*, the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, does not "introduce," does not intend to "introduce" and should not introduce any reorganisations which are not absolutely ripe both in economic reality and in the consciousness of an overwhelming majority of the people. The more terrible the economic collapse and the crisis produced by the war, the more urgent is the

need of a most perfect political form which facilitates the healing of the wounds inflicted by the war upon mankind. The less organisational experience the Russian people has, the more determinedly must we proceed with the organisational development of the people, not leaving it merely to the bourgeois politicians and bureaucrats with sinecures.

The sooner we cast off the pseudo-Marxian prejudices of Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co., the more diligently we start helping the people everywhere and immediately to organise Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies; the longer Messrs. Lvov and Co. procrastinate the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the easier will it be for the people to make (through the medium of the Constituent Assembly, or outside of it, if Lvov delays its convocation long) its decision in favour of a Republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. Blunders in the new organisational reconstruction by the people are inevitable at the beginning, but it is better to blunder while progressing than to wait until the professors of law called by Mr. Lvov will have written laws concerning the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the perpetuation of the parliamentary bourgeois republic and the strangulation of the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies.

If we organise and conduct our propaganda efficiently, not only the proletarians but nine-tenths of the peasantry will be against the re-establishment of the police, against an irremovable and privileged bureaucracy, against an army separated from the people. This alone constitutes the new type of state.

12. The substitution of a national militia for the police is a transformation that follows from the entire course of the revolution and that is now being introduced in most localities of Russia. We must make it clear to the masses that in the majority of revolutions of the usual bourgeois type, a transformation of that sort was very ephemeral and that the bourgeoisie, however democratic and republican it may have been, soon re-established the police of the old tsarist type, a police separated from the people, commanded by bourgeois and capable of oppressing the people in every way.

There is only one way to prevent the re-establishment of the old police: to organise a national militia, to fuse it with the army (the standing army to be replaced by a general arming of the people). The militia should comprise all citizens of both sexes between the ages of fifteen and sixty-five, these age limits being selected approxi-

mately to exclude minors and old people. Capitalists should pay their employés, servants and others for the days devoted to public service in the militia. Unless women are drawn into taking an independent part not only in political life generally, but also in daily social service obligatory to every one, it is idle to speak not only of Socialism but even of complete and stable democracy. Certain "police" functions, such as the care of the sick, of the homeless children, pure food supervision, etc., will never be satisfactorily discharged until women are on a footing of perfect equality with men, not only on paper but in reality.

To prevent the re-establishment of the police, to attract all organisational forces of the entire people to the creation of a universal militia—such are the tasks that the proletariat must bring to the masses in order to protect, strengthen and develop the revolution.

THE AGRARIAN AND THE NATIONAL PROGRAMMES

13. We cannot know for certain at present whether a gigantic agrarian revolution will develop in the near future in the Russian village. We cannot know how deep is the class cleavage that has undoubtedly deepened in recent time between agricultural labourers and the poorest peasants ("semi-proletarians") on the one hand, and the well-to-do and middle peasants (capitalists and petty capitalists) on the other. All such questions will be decided, and can be decided, by experience only.

We are in duty bound, however, as the party of the proletariat, immediately to step forth not only with an agrarian programme but also with the advocacy of immediately realisable practical measures in the interests of a peasant agrarian revolution in Russia.

We must demand the nationalisation of all lands, *i. e.*, the passing of all land ownership in the state to the central state power. This power shall fix the size, etc., of the migration fund,* issue laws for the conservation of forests, for melioration, etc., absolutely prohibit the intercession of middlemen between the landowner—the state—and the tenant—the tiller (prohibit every transfer of land). The disposition of all the land, however, the working out of all local rules of ownership and use, must not be left in the hands of bureaucrats and officials but be vested, wholly and exclusively, in the local and regional Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.

* Land to be allotted to peasants desirous of migrating from congested areas.—*Ed.*

In order to improve the technique of grain raising and to increase production in general, in order also to develop rational cultivation on a large scale, socially controlled, we must see to it that every Peasants' Committee organises out of the various estates confiscated by it a large model estate controlled by the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

To offset the petty-bourgeois phrases and policy of the Socialists-Revolutionists, particularly the empty words concerning the "standard of consumption" or "labour standard," the "socialisation of the land," etc., the party of the proletariat must make it clear that the system of small peasant households where production for the market prevails cannot save mankind from poverty or oppression.

Without necessarily splitting at once the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, the party of the proletariat must make clear the necessity of organising special Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies and special Soviets of Deputies from the poorest (semi-proletarian) peasants or, at least, special conferences of Deputies of the same class position continually meeting as separate groups or parties within the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. Otherwise all the sugary phraseology of the Narodniks on the subject of the peasants generally will prove a shield to cover up the deception of the destitute mass by the well-to-do peasants who are only one of the varieties of capitalists.

To offset the bourgeois-liberal or purely bureaucratic preachments on the part of many Socialists-Revolutionists and Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies who advise the peasants not to seize the landlords' lands and not to start any agrarian reform pending the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the party of the proletariat must urge the peasants to bring about at once, on their own initiative, the agrarian transformation, and to confiscate at once the landlords' lands by the decisions of the local Soviets of Peasants' Deputies.

In this connection, it is particularly important to insist on the necessity of increasing the production of foodstuffs for the soldiers at the front and for the cities, on the absolute inadmissibility of any kind of destruction or wastage of stock, tools, machinery, buildings, etc.

14. As regards the national question, the proletarian party must, first of all, insist on the promulgation and immediate realisation of full freedom of separation from Russia for all nations and peoples

who were oppressed by tsarism, who were forcibly included or forcibly retained within the boundaries of the state, *i.e.*, annexed.

All statements, declarations and manifestoes concerning the renunciation of annexations not accompanied by actual realisation of the freedom of separation, reduce themselves to bourgeois deception of the people, or to petty-bourgeois pious wishes.

The proletarian party strives to create as large a state as possible, for this is in the interest of the workers; it strives to bring the nations closely together, to fuse them, but it intends to bring that about not by the use of force, but only by a free, brotherly union of the workers and the toiling masses of all nations.

The more democratic the Russian republic is, the more speedily it will organise itself into a republic of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, the more powerful the force of attraction such a republic will be for the toiling masses of all nations.

Full freedom of separation, the broadest possible local (and national) autonomy, guarantees for the rights of national minorities elaborated in detail—such is the programme of the revolutionary proletariat.

NATIONALISATION OF BANKS AND CAPITALIST SYNDICATES

15. The party of the proletariat cannot by any means make it its aim to introduce Socialism in a country of small peasantry as long as the overwhelming majority of the population has not realised the necessity of a Socialist revolution.

Only bourgeois sophists, however, hiding behind "near-Marxist" phrases, can deduct from this truth a justification of a policy that tends to put off immediate revolutionary measures, which are perfectly ripe, which were frequently introduced during the war by a number of bourgeois states, and which are absolutely necessary for the struggle against approaching total economic disorganisation and famine.

Such measures as the nationalisation of the land, of all the banks and capitalist syndicates or, at least, the establishment of an immediate control of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies over them, by no means signifying the "introduction" of Socialism, must be absolutely fought for, and as far as possible introduced in a revolutionary way. Without such measures, which are only steps toward Socialism, and which are completely realisable economically, it is impossible to heal the wounds inflicted by the war and to prevent

the threatening collapse. The party of the revolutionary proletariat will never hesitate to lay hands on the unheard-of profits of the capitalists and bankers who enrich themselves most scandalously "in the war."

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

16. The international obligations of the Russian working class have been put in the forefront most forcefully these days.

Everybody swears by internationalism in our day; even chauvinist-defencists, even Messrs. Plekhanov and Potresov, even Kerensky, call themselves internationalists. The more urgent is the duty of the proletarian party to contrast, most clearly, decisively, definitely, internationalism in deed with internationalism in words.

Mere appeals to the workers of all countries, empty professions of international faith, direct or indirect attempts to establish a "sequence" of proletarian action in the various belligerent countries, attempts at concluding "agreements" between the Socialists of the belligerent countries concerning revolutionary struggle, pother about Socialist congresses aiming at peace propaganda,—all this, as far as the objective meaning is concerned, no matter how sincere the authors of such ideas, attempts and plans may be, is mere talk, at best innocent little wishes good only to cover up the deception of the masses by the chauvinists. The French social-chauvinists, most adroit and best versed in methods of parliamentary juggling, have long since broken the record of spouting incredibly loud and ringing pacifist and internationalist phrases coupled with the most brazen betrayal of Socialism and the International, by entering governments that are waging an imperialist war, by voting for credits or loans (as Chkheidze, Skobelev, Tsereteli and Steklov have been doing recently in Russia) and actively opposing the revolutionary struggle in their own country, etc., etc.

Good people often forget the cruel, savage setting of the imperialist World War. In such a setting, phrases are intolerable; innocent sweet wishes are despicable.

There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism: hard work at developing the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own land, and the support (by propaganda, sympathy, material aid) of such, and only such, struggles and policies in every country without exception.

Everything else is deception and Manilovism.*

The international Socialist and labour movement the world over has in the course of two and a half years of war evolved three tendencies. Whoever declines to recognise the existence of these three tendencies, to analyse them, to fight persistently for real active internationalism, condemns himself to impotence, helplessness and errors.

The three tendencies are:

1. Social-chauvinists, *i. e.*, Socialists in words and chauvinists in fact, people who are for “national defence” in any imperialist war (and particularly in this imperialist war).

These men are our class enemies. They have gone over to the bourgeoisie.

Such is the majority among the official leaders of the official Social-Democracy in every country. Plekhanov and Co. in Russia, the Scheidemanns in Germany, Renaudel, Guesde and Sembat in France, Bissolati and Co. in Italy, Hyndman, the Fabians and the Labourites in England, Branting and Co. in Sweden, Troelstra and his party in Holland, Stauning and his party in Denmark, Victor Berger and other “defenders of the fatherland” in America, etc.

2. The second tendency, the so-called “centre,” people vacillating between social-chauvinism and real internationalism.

Those of the “centre” swear and vow that they are Marxists, internationalists, that they are for peace, for exerting “pressure” upon the governments, for presenting all sorts of “demands” to the governments that the latter “manifest the people’s will to peace,” for all sorts of peace campaigns, for peace without annexations, etc., etc.—and for peace with the social-chauvinists. The “centre” is for “unity,” the “centre” is against schism.

The “centre” is a realm of sweet petty-bourgeois phrases, of internationalism in words, cowardly opportunism, and fawning before the social-chauvinists in deeds.

The gist of the matter is that the members of the “centre” do not believe in the necessity of revolution against their bourgeois governments; do not preach such revolution; do not carry on any determined revolutionary struggles, but in order to dodge such struggles resort to trite and most “Marxist” sounding excuses.

The social-chauvinists are our class enemies, they are bourgeois

* Manilov is a character in Gogol’s *Dead Souls* who is sentimental and dreams of impossible things.—*Ed.*

elements in the labour movement. Objectively they represent strata or groups of the working class bribed by the bourgeoisie (better wages, positions of honour, etc.) and helping their bourgeoisie to rob and oppress small and weak peoples, to fight for the division of capitalist spoils.

The members of the "centre" group are routine worshippers, slaves of rotten legality, corrupted by parliamentarism, etc., bureaucrats accustomed to nice sinecures and "peaceful" labours. Historically and economically, they do not represent any special stratum of society; they only represent the transition from the earlier labour movement as it was between 1871 and 1914, from a period that had given much valuable experience to the proletariat particularly in the indispensable art of slow, continued, systematic organisation work on a large, very large, scale, to the new period which has become objectively necessary since the first imperialist World War which has inaugurated the era of social revolution.

In Karl Kautsky, the main leader and representative of the "centre" and the most outstanding authority in the Second International (1889-1914), we have seen since August, 1914, a complete breakdown of Marxism, an unheard-of lack of principles, a series of most pitiful vacillations and betrayals. Among these centrists are Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour, and the so-called "labour-group" [*Arbeitsgemeinschaft*] in the Reichstag; in France, Longuet, Pressemene and the so-called "*minoritaires*"¹⁰² (Mensheviks) in general; in England, Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald and numerous other leaders of the Independent Labour Party,¹⁰³ and a part of the British Socialist Party;¹⁰⁴ Morris Hillquit and many others in the United States; Turati, Treves, Modigliani and others in Italy; Robert Grimm and others in Switzerland; Victor Adler and Co. in Austria; the party of the Organisation Committee, Axelrod, Martov, Chkheidze, Tsereteli and others in Russia, etc.

It goes without saying that at times individual persons do unconsciously drift from social-chauvinism to "centrism," and vice versa. Every Marxist knows, however, that classes retain their distinguishing characteristics regardless of the free movement of individuals from one class to another; similarly, movements in political life retain their distinguishing characteristics regardless of the free migration of individuals from one movement to another, and despite all attempts and efforts to fuse movements.

3. The third, real internationalist trend is most nearly represented

by the "Zimmerwald Left." In the supplement we reprint its Manifesto of September, 1915, so that the reader may become acquainted with the inception of this movement.

It is characterised by the complete break with social-chauvinism and "centrism," a relentless war against the imperialist home government and the imperialist home bourgeoisie. Its principle is "Our greatest enemy is at home." A ruthless struggle against nauseatingly sweet social-pacifist phrases (a social-pacifist is a Socialist in words, and a bourgeois-pacifist in deeds; bourgeois-pacifists dream of an everlasting peace without the overthrow of the yoke and domination of capital) and against all sophistry employed to demonstrate the impossibility, the inappropriateness, the untimeliness of a proletarian revolutionary struggle, of a proletarian Socialist revolution in connection with the present war.

The most outstanding representative of this tendency in Germany is the "Spartacus" or "International" Group, to which Karl Liebknecht belongs. Karl Liebknecht is the best known representative of this tendency and of the *new*, real, proletarian International.

Karl Liebknecht called upon the workers and soldiers of Germany to turn their guns upon their own government. Karl Liebknecht did that openly from the tribune of parliament, the Reichstag. He then went out to a demonstration on Potsdamer Platz, one of the largest public squares in Berlin, distributing illegally printed proclamations carrying the slogan "Down with the government." He was arrested and sentenced to hard labour. He is now serving his term in a German prison, like hundreds, if not thousands, of other real German Socialists who have been imprisoned for waging a struggle against war.

Karl Liebknecht attacked mercilessly in his speeches and his writings not only the German Plekhanovs and the Potresovs (the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Davids, etc.), but also the German centrists, the German Chkhheidzes and Tseretelis (Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour and Co.).

Karl Liebknecht and his friend, Otto Rühle, two out of one hundred and ten [Social-Democratic] Deputies in the Reichstag, broke the discipline, destroyed the "unity" with the "centre" and the chauvinists, and fought against everybody. Liebknecht alone represents Socialism, the proletarian cause, the proletarian revolution. The rest of the German Social-Democracy, to quote the apt

words of Rosa Luxemburg (also a member and one of the leaders of the Spartacus group), is "a stinking corpse."

Another group of real internationalists in Germany is gathered around the Bremen paper, *Arbeiterpolitik*.

Closest to real internationalists are: in France, Loriot and his friends (Bourderon and Merrheim have degenerated into social-pacifism), as well as the Frenchman Henri Guildeaux, who is publishing in Switzerland a paper called *Demain*; in England, the paper *Trade Unionist*, and some of the members of the British Socialist Party and of the Independent Labour Party (for instance, William Russell, who has openly called for a break with the leaders who have betrayed Socialism), the Scottish public school teacher and Socialist, MacLean, who has been sentenced to hard labour by the bourgeois government of England for his revolutionary activity against the war; hundreds of English Socialists who are in jail for the same offence. They, only they, are internationalists in deed. In the United States, the Socialist Labour Party and certain elements of the opportunist Socialist Party which in January, 1917, began to publish the paper *The Internationalist*¹⁰⁵; in Holland, the party of the "Tribunists," those who publish the daily paper *Tribune* (Anton Pannekoek, Herman Gorter, Wynkoop, and Henriette Roland-Holst, who, though a centrist at Zimmerwald, has now joined our ranks); in Sweden, the party of the youth or the Left with leaders such as Lindhagen, Ture Nerman, Carlson, Ström and S. Höglund, who at Zimmerwald was personally active in the organisation of the Zimmerwald Left, and who is now serving a prison term for his activity against the war; in Denmark, Trier and his friends who have left the now purely bourgeois "Social-Democratic" Party, headed by Minister Stauning; in Bulgaria, the "narrow-minded"¹⁰⁶; in Italy, the closest are Constantino Lazzari, secretary of the party, and Serrati, editor of the central organ, *Avanti*; in Poland, Karl Radek, Hanecki and other leaders of the Social-Democracy, united through the "District Administration"; Rosa Luxemburg, Tyszka, and other leaders of the Social-Democracy united through the "Central Administration"; in Switzerland, those "Lefts," who wrote the supporting argument for the "referendum" (January, 1917), in order to fight against the social-chauvinists and the "centre" of their country and who at the Zürich Canton Socialist Convention, held at Töss on February 11, 1917, introduced a consistently revolutionary resolution against

the war¹⁰⁷; in Austria, the young Left-wing friends of Friedrich Adler, who have been acting partly through the "Karl Marx" Club, at Vienna, a club now closed by the very reactionary Austrian government which is destroying Adler for his heroic but ill-considered attempt upon the life of the Prime Minister, etc., etc.

It is not a matter of shadings, these exist even among the "Lefts." It is a matter of the entire tendency. The point is, that it is by no means easy to be an internationalist in deeds during a terrible imperialist war. Such people are rare, but it is on them alone that the future of Socialism depends; they alone are the leaders of the masses, not the corrupters of the masses.

The difference between reformists and revolutionists in the ranks of the Social-Democrats and Socialists in general cannot but undergo, objectively, a positive change in the midst of an imperialist war. He who simply confines himself to "demanding" from bourgeois governments "the conclusion of peace" or "the manifestation of the will of the peoples toward peace," etc., is, in fact, degenerating into a reformist. For, objectively, the problem of war can be solved only in a revolutionary way.

There is no escape from this war to a democratic, non-oppressive peace, to a liberation of the peoples from the yoke of paying billions of interest to the capitalists enriched by the war, there is no other escape except a proletarian revolution.

We can, and we must, demand all sorts of reforms from the bourgeois governments, but it is impossible, without falling into Manilovism and reformism, to demand from those people and classes who are entangled by a thousand ties of imperialist capital to break those ties; yet unless we break those ties all talk of war against war is empty, deceitful prattle.

The "Kautskians," the "centre," are revolutionists in words, reformists in deeds, internationalists in words, supporters of social-chauvinism in deeds.

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE ZIMMERWALD INTERNATIONAL. THE NECESSITY OF FORMING A THIRD INTERNATIONAL

17. The Zimmerwald International took from the very first a vacillating, Kautskian, "centrist" position which immediately compelled the Zimmerwald Left to fence itself off, to separate itself from the rest, and to come forth with its own Manifesto (published in Switzerland in Russian, in German and in French).

The chief fault of the Zimmerwald International, the cause of its breakdown (for from a political and ideological viewpoint it has already broken down), was its vacillation, its indecision, when it came to the most important practical and all-determining question of breaking completely with the social-chauvinists and the old social-chauvinist International, headed by Vandervelde and Huysmans at The Hague (Holland), etc.

We Russians do not as yet know that the Zimmerwald majority are really Kautskians. But this is a basic fact which must not be minimised and of which Western Europe is now fully aware. Even that chauvinist, that extreme German chauvinist, Heilmann, editor of the arch-chauvinist *Chemnitzer Volksstimme*¹⁰⁸ and contributor to the arch-chauvinist *Glocke* of Parvus (a "Social Democrat," of course, and an ardent partisan of the Social-Democratic "unity"), was compelled to acknowledge in the press that the "centre," or Kautskyism and the Zimmerwald majority were one and the same thing.

The end of 1916 and the beginning of 1917 had definitely proved it. In spite of the condemnation of social-pacifism contained in the Kienthal Manifesto, the whole Zimmerwald Right, the entire Zimmerwald majority, degenerated into social-pacifism: Kautsky and Co., in a series of declarations during the months of January and February, 1917; Bourderon and Merrheim in France, who cast their votes together with the social-chauvinists for the pacifist resolutions of the Socialist Party (December, 1916) and of the *Confédération Générale du Travail*¹⁰⁹ (the national organisation of French labour unions), also in December, 1916; Turati and Co. in Italy, where the entire party took a social-pacifist position, while Turati himself, in a speech delivered on December 17, 1916, "slipped" (and not by accident, of course) into nationalistic phrases embellishing the imperialistic war.

In January, 1917, the chairman of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, Robert Grimm, joined hands with the social-chauvinists of his own party (Greulich, Pflueger, Gustav Mueller and others) against the real internationalists.

At two conferences of Zimmerwaldists of various countries, held in January and February of 1917, this dual, double-faced behaviour of the Zimmerwald majority was formally stigmatised by the Left internationalists of several countries, by Münzenberg, secretary of the internationalist organisation of the Young People's [Socialist]

movement and editor of the excellent internationalist publication *Die Jugendinternationale*,¹¹⁰ by Zinoviev, representative of the Central Committee of our party, by Karl Radek of the Polish Social-Democratic Party (the "District Administration"), by Hartstein, a German Social-Democrat and member of the "Spartacus Group."

To the Russian proletariat much has been given. Nowhere on earth has the working class yet succeeded in unfolding so much revolutionary energy as it has in Russia. But much is demanded from those to whom much is given.

We can stand no longer this Zimmerwald mire. We must not, on account of the Zimmerwald "Kautskians," remain more or less allied with the chauvinist International of the Plekhanovs and Scheidemanns. We must break with this International immediately. We ought to remain in Zimmerwald only to gather information.

It is precisely we who must found, right now, without delay, a new, revolutionary, proletarian International, or rather, not to fear to acknowledge publicly that this new International is already established and working.

This is the International of those "internationalists in deed," whom I have fully enumerated above, they alone represent the revolutionary, internationalist masses, they and not the corrupters of the masses.

Even if there are few Socialists of that type, let every Russian worker ask himself how many really conscious revolutionists there were in Russia on the eve of the March Revolution in 1917.

It is not so much a question of numbers; it is a question of expressing correctly the ideas and the policy of the truly revolutionary proletariat. Never mind about "proclaiming" internationalism; the essential thing is for us to be, even when the times are most trying, real internationalists in deed.

Let us not deceive ourselves by hopes for agreements and international congresses. As long as this imperialist war lasts, international relations are held as in a vise by the military dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. If even the "republican" Miliukov who had to suffer the "parallel government" of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, did not allow into Russia, in April, 1917, Fritz Platten, the Swiss Socialist, secretary of the party and internationalist, member of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, although Platten was married to a Russian woman, and was going for a visit to his wife's relatives, and although he had taken part in

the Revolution of 1905 in Riga, had served a term in a Russian prison for that offence, had given bail to the tsarist government for his release and wanted that bail returned to him—if the republican Miliukov could do such a thing, in April, 1917, and in Russia, then we can see how much stock we may take in the promises and offers, phrases and declarations made by the bourgeoisie on the subject of peace without annexations, etc.

And how about the arrest of Trotsky by the English Government?¹¹¹ And how about Martov being refused permission to leave Switzerland;¹¹² how about the attempt made to lure him to England, where he would share Trotsky's fate?

Let us not create illusions for ourselves. We need no self-deception.

"To wait" for international conferences and congresses is simply to betray internationalism, since it is established that Socialists loyal to internationalism are not allowed to come here even from Stockholm, they are not allowed even to send letters to us, despite the thoroughly rigorous military censorship that can be and is fully exercised on all writings.

Let us not "wait," let rather our party found at once a third International, and hundreds of Socialists imprisoned in England and in Germany will heave a sigh of relief; thousands upon thousands of German workers who are now organising strikes and demonstrations in an effort to frighten the scoundrel and murderer, Wilhelm, will read in illegal leaflets about our decision, about our fraternal confidence in Karl Liebknecht (and in him alone), about the decision to fight even now the "revolutionary defencists"; they will read and gain strength in their revolutionary internationalism.

Much is demanded from him to whom much is given. There is no other land on earth as free as Russia is now. Let us make use of this freedom not to support the bourgeoisie or bourgeois "revolutionary defencism," but to organize a third International, bold and honest and proletarian, the kind which Liebknecht would have, an International which will set its face boldly against all traitors, all social-chauvinists and the vacillating people of the "centre."

18. After what I have just said, I need not waste any words to explain that a union of the Social-Democrats of Russia is impossible.

Rather stay alone, as Liebknecht did, that is, remain with the

revolutionary proletariat, than to entertain even for a minute any thought of a union with the party of the Organisation Committee, with Chkhheidze and Tsereteli, who have joined hands with Potresov of the *Rabochaya Gazeta*, who voted for the war loan¹¹³ in the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, and who have degenerated into "revolutionary defencism."

Let the dead bury their dead.

Whosoever wants to help vacillating souls, should first stop vacillating himself.

A NAME FOR OUR PARTY WHICH WOULD BE SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND AND CONDUCIVE TO PROLETARIAN CLASS THINKING

19. I am coming to the last point, the name of our party. We must call ourselves the Communist Party—just as Marx and Engels called themselves Communists.

We must insist that we are Marxists and that we have as a basis the *Communist Manifesto*, which has been perverted and betrayed by the Social-Democracy on two important points: (1) The workers have no country; "national defence" in an imperialist war is a betrayal of Socialism; (2) Marx's teaching about the state has been perverted by the Second International.

The term "Social-Democracy" is unscientific, as Marx showed repeatedly, particularly in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, in 1875,¹¹⁴ and as Engels restated in a more popular form, in 1894. Mankind can pass directly from capitalism only into Socialism, i. e., into social ownership of the means of production and the distribution of products according to the work of the individual. Our party looks farther ahead than that: Socialism is bound sooner or later to ripen into Communism, whose banner bears the motto: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

That is the first reason.

Here is my second: The second part of the term "Social-Democracy" is scientifically wrong. Democracy is only a form of state, while we Marxists are opposed to every form of state.

The leaders of the Second International (1889-1914), Messrs. Plekhanov, Kautsky and their ilk, perverted and debased Marxism.

The difference between Marxism and Anarchism is that Marxism admits the necessity of the state during the transition from capitalism to Socialism; but (and here is where we differ from Kautsky and

Co.) not the kind of state found in the usual, parliamentary, bourgeois, democratic republic, but rather something like the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Soviets of Workers' Deputies of 1905 and 1917.

There is a third reason: Life and the revolution have already established here in a concrete way (although in a form which is still weak and embryonic), this new type of "state," though it is not really a state in the proper sense of the word.

It is now a question of the action of the masses and not merely of theories of leaders.

Essentially the state is the power exercised over the masses by a group of armed men separated from the people.

Our new state, which is now in process of being born, is also a real state, for we, too, need detachments of armed men; we, too, need the strictest order, and the ruthless crushing of all attempts at a tsarist as well as a Guchkov-bourgeois counter-revolution.

But our forming, new state is not yet a state in the proper sense of the word, for the detachments of armed men found in many parts of Russia are really the masses themselves, the people, and not simply privileged individuals, practically unremovable, placed above and separated from the people.

We ought to look forward, not backward; we ought to look away from the usual bourgeois type of democracy which has been strengthening the domination of the bourgeoisie by means of the old, monarchistic organs of government,—the police, the army, and the bureaucracy.

We must look forward to the advent of the newly born democracy, which is already ceasing to be a democracy, for democracy means the people's rule, while, obviously, an armed people could not rule over itself.

The word democracy is not only not scientific when applied to the Communist Party, but, since March, 1917, it has simply become a blinker placed upon the eyes of the revolutionary people, preventing the latter from establishing boldly, freely, and on its own initiative a new form of power: the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', etc., Deputies, as the sole power in the state and as the harbinger of the "withering away" of the state as such.

There is a fourth reason: We must take into account the objective international condition of Socialism.

Its condition is no longer what it was between the years 1871

and 1914, when Marx and Engels consciously allowed the inaccurate, opportunist term "Social-Democracy." For history proved that what was most needed in those days, *i. e.*, right after the defeat of the Paris Commune, was slow work of organisation and enlightenment. Nothing else was possible. The Anarchists were then, as they are now, theoretically, economically, and politically wrong. The Anarchists made a wrong estimate of the time, for they did not understand the world situation: the worker of England corrupted by imperialist profits; the Paris Commune destroyed; the bourgeois-national movement in Germany flushed with recent victory; and semi-feudal Russia still sleeping the sleep of centuries.

Marx and Engels gauged the hour accurately; they understood the international situation; they realised the need of a slow approach toward the beginning of the Social Revolution.

We, in turn, must understand the peculiarities and the tasks of the new epoch. Let us not imitate the woe-Marxians of whom Marx himself said: "I sowed dragons and I reaped fleas." *

The objective needs of capitalism which has grown into imperialism have brought forth the imperialist war. This war has brought mankind to the brink of a precipice, to the destruction of civilisation, the ruin and brutalisation of countless millions of human beings.

There is no other way out, except a proletarian revolution.

And just when that revolution is beginning, when it is taking its first awkward, timid, weak, unconscious steps, when it is still trusting the bourgeoisie, at that moment the majority (it is the truth, it is a fact) of the Social-Democratic leaders, of the Social-Democratic parliamentarians, of the Social-Democratic papers, in a word, all those who could spur the masses to action, or at least the majority of them, are betraying Socialism, are selling Socialism, are going to fight the battles of their national bourgeoisie.

The masses are distracted, baffled, deceived by their leaders.

And should we aid and abet that deception by retaining the old and worn-out party name, which is as decayed as the Second International?

It may be that many workers understand the meaning of Social-Democracy honestly. It is high time that we learn to distinguish between the objective and the subjective.

* An expression which Marx borrowed from Heine.—*Ed.*

Subjectively, these workers, who are Social-Democrats, are the most loyal leaders of the proletarian masses.

Objectively, however, the world situation is such that the old name of our party helps to fool the masses and retard their onward march. Every day, in every paper, in every parliamentary group, the masses see leaders, *i.e.*, people whose voice carries far, whose acts are very much in evidence, who also call themselves Social-Democrats, who are "for unity" with the betrayers of Socialism, the social-chauvinists, and who are trying to collect on the notes issued by Social-Democracy. . . .

Are there any reasons against the new name? We are told that one may confuse us with Anarchists-Communists.

Why are we not afraid of being confused with the Social-Nationalists, the Social-Liberals, the Radical-Socialists, the foremost, the most adroit bourgeois party in the French Republic at deceiving the masses? We are told: "The masses have grown used to the name, the workers have learned to love their Social-Democratic Party."

That is the only reason, but this reason goes counter to the teachings of Marxism, disregards the revolutionary tasks of tomorrow, the objective position of Socialism the world over, the shameful breakdown of the Second International, and the injury done to the cause by the pack of "also Social-Democrats" surrounding the proletarians.

This reason is based solely on laziness, somnolence, and love of routine.

We want to rebuild the world. We want to end this imperialist World War in which hundreds of millions of people are involved and billions of dollars are invested, a war which cannot be ended in a truly democratic way without the greatest proletarian revolution in history.

And here we are, afraid of our own shadow. Here we are, keeping on our backs the same old soiled shirt. . . .

It is high time to cast off the soiled shirt, it is high time to put on clean linen.

N. LENIN.

Petrograd, April 10, 1917.

First published as a separate pamphlet, September, 1917, by the "Pribor" publishing firm.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN RUSSIA AND THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT¹¹⁵

THE following is an attempt to formulate, first, the more important, and second, the less important, questions and answers characterising the present situation in Russia, and the attitude the various parties take to that situation.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

1. *What are the chief groupings of political parties in Russia?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) Parties and groups to the right of the Constitutional-Democrats.

B. (C. D.) Constitutional-Democratic Party (Cadets, the People's Freedom Party) and the groups close to it.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) The Social Democrats, the Socialists-Revolutionists and the groups close to them.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") The party which ought properly to be called the Communist Party, and which is at present named "The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, united through the Central Committee"; or, in popular language, the "Bolsheviks."

2. *What class do these parties represent? What class standpoints do they express?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) The feudal landowners and the most backward sections of the bourgeoisie (the capitalists).

B. (C.-D.) The bourgeoisie as a whole, that is, the capitalists, and those landowners who have become bourgeoisified, *i. e.*, become capitalists.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Small proprietors, small and middle-sized peasants, petty bourgeoisie, as well as that section of the workers which has come under the influence of the bourgeoisie.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Class-conscious proletarians, wage workers and the poorest section of the peasantry (semi-proletarians) who are close to them.

3. *What is their relation to Socialism?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Unconditionally

hostile, since it threatens the profits of capitalists and landowners.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) For Socialism, but it is too early yet to think of it or to take any practical steps for its realisation.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") For Socialism. The Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies must at once take every practical and feasible step for its realisation.*

4. What form of government do they want now?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) Constitutional monarchy, absolute power of the bureaucracy and the police.

B. (C.-D.) A bourgeois parliamentary republic, *i. e.*, a strengthening of the rule of the capitalists, with the old bureaucracy and the police retained.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) A bourgeois parliamentary republic, with reforms for the workers and peasants.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") A republic of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. Abolition of the standing army and the police; substituting for them a universally armed people; officials to be not only elected, but also subject to recall; their pay not to exceed that of a skilled worker.

5. What is their attitude to the restoration of the Romanov monarchy?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) In favour, but they act with caution and secrecy, for they are afraid of the people.

B. (C.-D.) When the Guchkovs seemed to be a power, the Cadets were in favour of putting on the throne a brother or the son of Nicholas, but when the people began to seem a power, the Cadets became anti-monarchists.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R) and D. ("Bolsheviks.") Unconditionally opposed to any kind of monarchist restoration.

6. What do they think of seizure of power? What do they regard as order, and what as anarchy?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) If a Tsar or a brave general seizes power, his authority comes from God; that is order. Anything else is anarchy.

B. (C.-D.) If the capitalists seize power, though by force, that is order; to seize power against the will of the capitalists would be anarchy.

* For the nature of these steps, see questions 20 and 22.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) If the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', etc., Deputies alone seize power, anarchy threatens. For the present let the capitalists retain power, while the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies have a "Contact Commission."

D. ("Bolsheviks.") All power must be in the hands of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', Agricultural Labourers', etc., Deputies. The entire propaganda, agitation and organisation of millions upon millions of people must at once be directed toward this end.*

7. Shall the Provisional Government be supported?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Unquestionably, since it is the only means at this moment of guarding the interests of the capitalists.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Yes, but under the condition that it should carry out its agreement with the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and participate at the meetings of the "Contact Commission."

D. ("Bolsheviks.") No; let the capitalists support it. We must prepare the whole people for the absolute concentration of all power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', etc., Deputies.

8. For single or dual power?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) For sole power in the hands of the capitalists and landowners.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) For dual power. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to exercise "control" over the Provisional Government. But it is harmful to think that control is impossible without power.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") For sole power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', etc., Deputies from top to bottom over the whole country.

9. Shall a Constituent Assembly be called?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) Not necessary, for it might injure the landowners. Who knows, the peasants at the Constituent Assembly may decide to take away the land of the landowners.

B. (C.-D.) Yes, but without stipulation of time. Prolonged consultation with professors of jurisprudence; first, because, as

* Anarchy is a complete negation of state power, whereas the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies are also state power.

Bebel has already pointed out, jurists are the most reactionary people in the world; and second, because the experience of all revolutions shows that the cause of the people is lost when it is entrusted to professors.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Yes, and as soon as possible. The date must be designated; we have already discussed it at the meetings of the "Contact Commission" 200 times and shall speak about it finally at our 201st discussion to-morrow.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Yes, and as soon as possible. Yet, to make it successful and to have it convoked, one condition is necessary: increase the number and strengthen the power of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants', etc., Deputies; organise and arm the masses. Only thus can the Assembly be assured.

10. Does the state need a police of the usual type and a standing army?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Absolutely, for this is the only permanent guarantee of the rule of capital; in case of necessity, as shown by the experience of all countries, the return from republic to monarchy is thus greatly facilitated.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) On the one hand, they may not be necessary. On the other hand, is not so radical a change premature? However, we shall discuss it in the "Contact Commission."

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Absolutely unnecessary. Immediately and unconditionally introduce universal arming of the people, merge them with the militia and the army. Capitalists must pay the workers for days of service in the militia.

11. Does the state need an officialdom of the usual type?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Unquestionably. Nine-tenths of the officials are sons and brothers of the landowners and capitalists. They should continue to form a privileged, in fact an unremovable, body of persons.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) This is hardly the proper time to put a question which was practically put by the Paris Commune.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Absolutely not. All officials must not only be elected by the people, but each and every official and Deputy must at all times be subject to the people's recall. Their pay shall not exceed that of an experienced worker. They are gradually to be replaced by the national militia and its various divisions.

12. Must officers be elected by the soldiers?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) No, it would be harmful for the landowners and capitalists. If the soldiers cannot otherwise be appeased, one must promise them this reform and afterwards take it away from them.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Yes.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Not only must they be elected, but every step of every officer and general must be subject to control by special soldiers' committees.

13. Are arbitrary removals of superiors by the soldiers desirable?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Absolutely harmful. Guchkov has already forbidden them, even threatening with the use of force. We must support Guchkov.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Useful, but it remains to be decided whether they must be removed before or after consulting the Contact Commission.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") They are in every respect useful and indispensable. The soldiers will obey only superiors of their own choice; they can respect no others.

14. In favour of this war or against it?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Unquestionably in favour, for it brings unheard-of profits to the capitalists and promises to perpetuate their rule, thanks to disunity among the workers, who are egged on against each other. The workers must be deceived by calling the war a war for national defence, with the special object of dethroning Wilhelm.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) In general, we are opposed to imperialist wars, but we are willing to permit ourselves to be fooled, and to call "revolutionary defencism" the support of an imperialist war waged by the imperialist government of Guchkov, Miliukov and Co.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Absolutely opposed to all imperialist wars, to all bourgeois governments which wage them, among them our own Provisional Government; absolutely opposed to "revolutionary defencism" in Russia.

15. Are they in favour of or against the predatory international treaties concluded between the Tsar and England, France, etc.

(*for the strangling of Persia, the division of China, Turkey, Austria, etc.*)?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Absolutely in favour. At the same time we must not think of publishing these treaties, because it is neither permitted by Anglo-French imperialist capital and its governments, nor desired by Russian capital which cannot afford to reveal to the people all its filthy machinations.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Against, but we still hope that the Contact Commission, aided by a series of simultaneous "campaigns" among the masses, may "influence" the capitalist government.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Against. Our whole task is simply this: To enlighten the masses as to the utter hopelessness of expecting anything in this connection from capitalist governments, and the necessity of centring all power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest peasants.

16. In favour of or against annexations?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) If the annexations are accomplished by the German capitalists and their robber chieftain, Wilhelm, we are opposed to them. If by the English, we are not opposed, for they are "our" allies. If by our capitalists, who forcibly retain within the boundaries of Russia the peoples oppressed by the Tsar, then we are in favour, we do not call this annexation.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Against annexations, but we hope it may be possible to obtain even from the capitalist government a "promise" to renounce annexations.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Against annexations. Any promise of a capitalist government to renounce annexations is sheer fraud. It is very simple to expose it: just demand that each people be freed from the yoke of its own capitalists.

17. In favour of or against the "Liberty Loan"?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Entirely in favour, for it facilitates the waging of an imperialist war, that is, a war to determine which group of capitalists shall rule the world.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) In favour, for our incorrect attitude on "revolutionary defencism" forces us into this obvious defection from the cause of internationalism.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Against, for the war remains imperialist;

it is being waged by capitalists in alliance with capitalists and in the interest of capitalists.

18. Shall we leave to capitalist governments the task of manifesting the people's will to peace, or shall we not?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) We shall, for the experience of the social-chauvinists of the French Republic shows best how people may be deceived by such a process: say anything you please, but in reality retain all conquests we have made from the Germans (their colonies) and take away from the Germans all conquests made by those robbers.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) We shall, since we have not yet relinquished all the unfounded hopes which the petty bourgeoisie attaches to the capitalists.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") We shall not, for the class-conscious worker puts no hopes whatever in the capitalists, and it is our function to enlighten the masses as to the baselessness of such hopes.

19. Must all monarchies be abolished?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) No, certainly not the English, Italian and Allied monarchies, only the German, Austrian, Turkish, and Bulgarian, for victory over them will increase our profits tenfold.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) A certain "order" must be followed and a beginning made with Wilhelm; we may wait a bit with the Allied monarchies.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Revolutions do not proceed in a fixed order. We must assist only those who are revolutionists in deeds, and we must dethrone all monarchs in all countries without exception.

20. Shall the peasants at once take all the land of the landowners?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) By no means. We must wait for the Constituent Assembly. Shingarev has already pointed out that when the capitalists take away the power from the Tsar, that is a great and glorious revolution, but when the peasants take away the land from the landowners, that is arbitrary rule. Commissions of conciliation must be appointed, with equal representation of landowners and peasants, and the chairman shall be from the officialdom, that is, from among the same capitalists and landowners.¹¹⁶

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) It would be better for the peasants to wait for the Constituent Assembly.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") All the land must be taken at once. Order must be strictly maintained by the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. The production of bread and meat must be increased, the soldiers better fed. Injury to live stock, tools, etc., is absolutely not permissible.

21. *Shall we limit ourselves solely to Soviets of Peasants' Deputies for the management of lands and for all village affairs in general?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) The landowners and capitalists are entirely opposed to absolute concentration of power in the hands of the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies in the villages. But if these Soviets are unavoidable, they say, we must confine ourselves to them alone, for, after all, the rich peasant is also a capitalist.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) We might for the present confine ourselves to the Soviets, although the Social-Democrats "in principle" do not deny the necessity of a separate organisation for the agricultural wage workers.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") It will be impossible to confine ourselves only to general Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, for the wealthy peasants are of the same capitalist class that is always inclined to injure or deceive the agricultural workers, the day labourers, and the poorer peasants. We must at once form special organisations of these latter groups of the village population both within the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies and in the form of special Soviets of Deputies of the agricultural workers.

22. *Shall the people take into their hands the largest and most powerful monopolistic organisations of capitalism, the banks, the syndicates of manufacturers, etc.?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Not by any means, since that might injure the landowners and capitalists.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Generally speaking, we are in favour of such organisations' passing into the hands of the entire people, but to think of or prepare for this condition now is very untimely.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") We must at once prepare the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, the Soviets of Deputies of Banking Employés

and others for the task of, first, taking all feasible and completely realisable steps toward merging all banks into one single national bank, then towards control by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies over the banks and syndicates, and then toward their nationalisation, that is, their passing over into the possession of the whole people.

23. What form of Socialist International, establishing and realising a brotherly union of all the workers in all countries, is now needed for the people?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) Generally speaking, any kind of Socialist International is harmful and dangerous to capitalists and landowners, but if the German Plekhanov, *i. e.*, Scheidemann, will come to an agreement with the Russian Scheidemann, *i. e.*, Plekhanov, and if they detect in each other vestiges of Socialist conscience, then we, the capitalists, must hail such an International, of such Socialists, who stand on the side of their respective governments.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) A Socialist International is needed that will include all elements: the Scheidemanns, the Plekhanovs and the "centrists," *i. e.*, those who vacillate between social-chauvinism and internationalism. The bigger the mix-up, the greater the "unity": long live our great Socialist unity!

D. ("Bolsheviks.") The peoples need only such an International as unites really revolutionary workers capable of putting an end to the awful and criminal slaughter, capable of delivering humanity from the yoke of capitalism. Only men (groups, parties, etc.) like the German Socialist Karl Liebknecht, now in prison, only people who will tirelessly struggle against their own government, their own bourgeoisie, their own social-chauvinists, and their own "centre," can and must immediately establish that International which is necessary for the peoples.

24. Must fraternisation between soldiers of the warring countries, at the front, be encouraged?

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) and B. (C.-D.) No, it is bad for the interests of the landowners and capitalists, since it may accelerate the liberation of humanity from their yoke.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Yes, it would be good. But we are not fully convinced that such an encouragement of fraternisation should be at once undertaken in all warring countries.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Yes, it is good and indispensable. It is absolutely necessary in all warring countries to encourage all attempts at fraternisation between the soldiers of both warring groups.

25. *What colour of the flag would fit the character of the various political parties?*

A. (To the right of the C.-D.) Black, for these are the real Black Hundreds.

B. (C.-D.) Yellow, for that is the international banner of those who serve capital through choice and not by compulsion.

C. (S.-D. and S.-R.) Pink, for their whole policy is a rosewater policy.

D. ("Bolsheviks.") Red, for that is the emblem of the international proletarian revolution.

This pamphlet was written at the beginning of April, 1917. As to whether it has grown out of date after May 6, 1917, after the forming of the "new" coalition government, my answer is: No, for the Contact Commission has not really disappeared, it has simply moved to another chamber, shared with the gentlemen of the cabinet. The fact that the Chernovs and the Tseretelis have moved into another chamber has not changed either their own policy nor the policy of their parties.

First published as a separate pamphlet in July, 1917, by the "Zhizn i Znanie" publishing firm.

SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF SOLDIERS OF THE IZMAILOV REGIMENT

YESTERDAY Comrade Zinoviev and I spoke at a meeting of the Izmailov Regiment, after an agitator from the Petrograd Committee had spoken. I said the following:

Comrades, Soldiers! The question of the state system is now on the order of the day. The capitalists, in whose hands the state power now rests, desire a parliamentary bourgeois republic, *i. e.*, a state system in which there is no Tsar, but in which power remains in the hands of the capitalists who govern the country by means of the old institutions, namely: the police, the bureaucrats, the standing army.

We desire a different republic, far more suited to the interests of the people, far more democratic. The revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd have overthrown tsarism, and have cleaned out all the police from the capital. The workers of all the world look with pride and hope at the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Russia as the vanguard of the universal liberating army of the working class. Having begun the revolution, it is necessary to strengthen and continue it. We must not permit them to re-establish the police! All power in the state, from top to bottom, from the remotest village to the last street in the City of Petrograd must belong to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Agricultural Labourers', and Peasants' Deputies. The central state power must be united in these local Soviets—whether you call them a Constituent Assembly or a National Assembly, or a Congress of Soviets, the name does not matter.

There must be no police; no bureaucrats, who have no responsibility to the people, who stand over the people; no standing army, cut off from the people, but *only the people, universally armed*, united in the Soviets—it is they who must run the state. It is they who must establish the necessary order, it is they whose authority will not only be obeyed, but *also respected*, by workers and peasants.

Only this power, only the Soviets of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies, can—not in the interests of the landowners, nor in the bureaucratic manner—solve the great question of land. The land must not belong to the feudal owners. The land must be taken away from the landowners at once by the peasant committees; they must carefully guard all the inventory against harm, and must see to it that the raising of grain is *increased* in order that the soldiers at the front may be better supplied. All the land must belong to the whole people, and this consummation must be realised by the local Soviets of Peasants' Deputies. In order that the rich peasants—themselves capitalists—may not injure and hoodwink the agricultural labourers and the poorest peasants, it will be necessary for the latter either to have their own conferences, to combine, to unite separately, or to form their own Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Do not permit the police to be re-established; do not permit the state power or the control over the government to pass into the hands of bourgeois officeholders not chosen by election, and irremovable, and paid on a bourgeois scale; unite yourselves, weld yourselves firmly together, organise yourselves, trusting no one, depending only on your own intelligence and experience; and Russia will be able to move with firm, measured, unerring steps toward the liberation both of our own country and of all humanity from the yoke of capital as well as from the horrors of war. Our government, a government of capitalists, is continuing the war by reason of capitalist interests. Like the German capitalists, headed by their crowned murderer Wilhelm, the capitalists of *all* the other countries are waging a war only for a division of the profits of the capitalists, for world rule. Hundreds of millions of people, almost all the countries of the earth, have been dragged into this criminal war. Hundreds of billions of capital have been invested in "profitable" concerns, bringing to the peoples death, hunger, ruin, barbarism, and to capital scandalously high, insane profits. In order to free ourselves from this frightful war, and to conclude a truly democratic peace not based on force, there is only one possible way: the transfer of all the state power to the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The workers and the poorest peasants, who are not interested in the preservation of the profits of capitalism, in the conquest of weaker peoples, will be able truly

to bring about that which the capitalists merely blabber about—namely, a conclusion of the war with a lasting peace which will assure liberty to all peoples without exception.

N. LENIN.

Pravda, No. 30, April 25, 1917.

A SHAMELESS LIE OF THE CAPITALISTS

It seems insufficient for the capitalists that their papers lie and carry on a pogrom agitation against the *Pravda*, that the *Riech* vies in this respect with the very *Russkaia Volia*, which it cannot help but despise. The Ministers of the capitalist government have now adopted the language of the *Russkaia Volia*. The *Riech* quotes to-day Minister Nekrasov's statement made before a meeting of the Cadet party in Moscow on April 9:

"The preaching of violence that comes from the Kamenno-ostrovsky Prospect is terrible."¹¹⁷

The worthy Minister, in imitation of the *Russkaia Volia*, lies shamelessly, deceives the people, aids the pogrom makers while hiding behind their backs and dares not name directly even one person, one newspaper, one orator, or one party.

The worthy Minister prefers dark insinuations—hoping that people will fall for that!

But all politically minded people will understand that the worthy Minister refers to the organ of the Central Committee of the R. S. D. L. P., the *Pravda*, and its followers.

Mr. Minister, worthy member of the "People's Freedom Party," you are lying. It is Mr. Guchkov who preaches violence when he threatens to punish the soldiers for removing the authorities. It is the *Russkaia Volia*, the pogrom newspaper of the pogrom "republicans" and friendly to you, that preaches violence.

The *Pravda* and its followers do not preach violence. On the contrary, they declare most clearly, precisely, and definitely, that our main work should at present be concentrated on *explaining* to the proletarian masses their proletarian problems, as distinguished from the problems of the petty bourgeoisie which has succumbed to chauvinist poison.

While you, Messrs. capitalists, Guchkov and Co., confine yourselves to mere threats of violence, while you have not yet resorted to violence, while the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies still exist, while you have not yet carried out your threats against the Soviets (such threats, for example, have actually been printed

by Mr. Miliukov's co-worker, Mr. Wilson, the correspondent of the *Times*), while you do not yet perpetrate violence upon the masses, we, the Pravdists, declare and reiterate that we regard the Soviets as the *only possible* form of government.

While you, Messrs. capitalists, who are in control of the army command, have not yet begun practicing violence, we, the Pravdists, we of the party, confine ourselves to the struggle for influence among the proletarian masses, the struggle for influence among the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, to exposing the errors in their tactics, to exposing the deceptiveness of the chauvinist (revolutionary-defencist) poison gas.

The worthy Minister Nekrasov knows it quite well,—he could learn it from the very quotations which the *Riech* was forced to print. The worthy Minister imitates the *Russkaia Volia*; he is intent on preventing a peaceful elucidation of the truth by resorting to lies, calumny, baiting, and threats of pogroms.

This won't work, Messrs. Nekrasovs, this won't work!

The workers and the soldiers are determined to know the truth, are determined to gain an insight into the problems of war, peace, and state systems, and they certainly will begin to do so.

Pravda, No. 30, April 25, 1917.

THE WAR AND THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

. . . We have nevertheless compelled the Provisional Government to renounce annexations.—From a speech by U. Steklov, delivered at the Tauride Palace on April 4.

. . . Whatever our attitude towards the slogan, "peace without annexations," it is impossible to ignore the principles accepted by all the allies. . . . —From a speech by P. Miliukov, *Riech*, April 24.

STEP by step the leaders of the Provisional Government are revealing the real nature of their policy with respect to the war. Already the notorious declaration of the Provisional Government¹¹⁸ contained, along with a verbal "renunciation" of annexations, a statement that "our" treaties with the English and the French governments remain in force. A few weeks later the *Riech*, organ of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Miliukov, prints the following:

MILIUKOV'S STATEMENT

While in Moscow, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, P. N. Miliukov, made the following statement at a meeting of members of the People's Freedom Party:

The declaration of the Provisional Government concerning the aims of the war contains not peace terms, but general principles repeatedly enunciated in the past by various statesmen of our allies. The peace terms can be worked out only with the consent of our allies and in accordance with the London Agreement.¹¹⁹ Whatever our attitude toward the slogan, "peace without annexations," it is impossible to ignore the principles accepted by all the Allies concerning the unification of Poland, Armenia, and the gratification of the national aspirations of the Austrian Slavs.—*Riech*, No. 83, April 24, 1917.

This statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Miliukov, will, no doubt, be reprinted in all the foreign press and will strengthen the military spirit in Germany. Miliukov helps the German imperialists to inflame chauvinist feeling in Germany; *Miliukov helps Wilhelm II to carry on this predatory war "to the end."*

Let us analyse Mr. Miliukov's statement. The declaration of the Provisional Government concerning the aims of the war (the same declaration which U. Steklov, owing to a deplorable misunderstanding, mistook for a renunciation of the policy of annexations) contains, says Miliukov, not peace terms, but merely "general prin-

ciples repeatedly enunciated in the past by various statesmen of our allies." Translated into ordinary language, this means: The renunciation of annexations is merely a fine phrase; "general principles," words, words, words. These words have been repeated *ad nauseam* by "our" allies. The actual "peace" terms, however, are an entirely different matter.

A statesman, Bismarck, if I am not mistaken, once said: To accept "*in principle*" means in the language of diplomacy to reject in *actuality*. It is the same with Miliukov. "In principle" he is against annexations, in *actuality* he is for annexations. That is why he insists on war "to the end."

Fine phrases are not yet peace terms, Mr. Miliukov declares.

What, then, are his peace terms?

These terms are provided by the London Agreement. Mr. Miliukov refers us to it.

But who concluded that Agreement? Tsar Nicholas II concluded it with the English and French capitalists! That means that the treaties concluded by the Tsar's clique are to remain in force. That means that we are fighting for the sake of those predatory treaties concluded by the Tsar's clique and the "Allied" bankers.

Seizure of Polish, Armenian, and Austrian territories (this time Mr. Miliukov omitted to mention Constantinople)—this is what Mr. Miliukov's peace programme reduces itself to.

What will the leaders of the majority of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies say regarding this last statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Miliukov? They will confine themselves to making an "animadversion" upon Miliukov's statement in the name of the "Contact Commission." . . . What has become of the "Provisional Government's promise to renounce annexations," which U. Steklov and N. Chkheidze claim to have succeeded in obtaining from it?

There is no dual power in Russia. The Soviet of Workers' Deputies merely exercises a benevolent control over the Provisional Government. Thus maintained, if we should believe newspaper reports, N. Chkheidze, at the military conference in Minsk.¹²⁰

This is what we have come to with this benevolent control! Russia's spokesmen are people who continue to encourage war. The workers and soldiers are fed on general phrases about peace without annexations, while secretly a policy is being carried out which benefits only a small clique of millionaires who thrive on war.

Comrades, workers, and soldiers! Read this statement of Miliukov and expose it at all your meetings! Make it understood that you do not wish to die for the sake of secret treaties concluded by Tsar Nicholas II, and still sacred to Miliukov!

Pravda, No. 31, April 26, 1917.

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF THE *RUSSKAIA VOLIA*

THE methods of the *Russkaia Volia*, a paper from which even the Cadets turn away with disgust, find an increasing number of imitators. Behold Mr. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo*. Intent on "exposing" the *Pravda*, Mr. Plekhanov takes Lenin's first thesis, quotes that part of it which asserts that as far as Russia is concerned the war remains predatory and imperialist, and then triumphantly asks:

"And how about Germany? Lenin says nothing about that."¹²¹

So, exactly so. One reads, and doesn't believe his eyes. Has Mr. Plekhanov actually stooped to the level of the *Novoie Vremia* and the *Russkaia Volia*? Incredible, but the facts stare one in the face.

Mr. Plekhanov's shamelessness exceeds all bounds. He knows thoroughly the Bolshevik literature published abroad. He knows perfectly well that all Bolsheviks, without exception, have always, in their speeches, in their articles, and in their resolutions, maintained that the war on the part of Germany was just as predatory and imperialist as on the part of the other warring "great" nations. The German capitalists, and their chief, the crowned murderer Wilhelm, are imperialist plunderers no less than the capitalists of other countries.

We repeat: no literate person who is in the least familiar with the views of the Bolsheviks can help knowing our attitude in this matter. Mr. Plekhanov, too, knows it quite well. He knows that Zinoviev and Lenin's pamphlet, *Socialism and the War*, was published in Switzerland in the German language, and was smuggled into Germany. In that pamphlet it is clearly stated that Germany is carrying on a predatory war for the purpose of "robbing the countries that are competing with it," that Germany is "*a young and powerful brigand*," that "*the German imperialists have shamefully violated the neutrality of Belgium*, as have warring nations always and everywhere, trampling, as they do, upon all treaties and obligations when necessary"; that "*Kautsky combines in an unprincipled way the main idea of social-chauvinism,—namely, national defence in the present war,—with a seeming concession to the*

Lefts"; that "nowhere have the opportunist-chauvinists reached such a low level of abasement and treason as in Germany."

Mr. Plekhanov knows all this, yet he stoops to the methods of the *Novoie Vremia* and the *Russkaia Volia*, and tries to paint the followers of the *Pravda* as Germanophiles. Making a mockery of Marxism, Mr. Plekhanov further quibbles over the question as to who began the war.

Mr. Plekhanov has forgotten that Marxists regard war as a *continuation of politics* conducted by certain governments representing certain classes. That both Nicholas II and Wilhelm II represented the reactionary and capitalist classes of their respective countries, that during the last few decades both had been pursuing a policy of robbing foreign countries, pillaging China, stifling Persia, cutting up and partitioning Turkey, is a well-known fact. Had Mr. Plekhanov studied (even in a superficial manner) the history of diplomacy and foreign policies of the last few decades, he could not have failed to observe it, and he would not have dared to deny it.

And it is precisely this predatory and imperialist policy, so closely bound up with the banking capital of the two countries that Nicholas II and Wilhelm II have followed in the present war.

When war is waged by two opposing groups of looters and oppressors merely for the robbers' booty, merely to decide as to who shall have a better chance to stifle more peoples, to grab more,—then the question as to who began this war, who was the first to declare it and so forth, is of no economic or political importance.

Mr. Plekhanov has descended, just as have the German Plekhanovs, the Scheidemanns and Co., to the level of the most vulgar and mediocre bourgeois chauvinist who refuses to see (or who never did see) that war is a continuation of politics, that war and politics are bound up with the interests of certain classes, and that one must be able to analyse which classes are fighting and for what they are fighting.

A rabid, brazen lie, a shielding of the predatory policy of Nicholas II—a policy which has not been changed by Lvov and Co. (they have even confirmed the Tsar's treaties!),—this is the whole of Mr. Plekhanov's great wisdom.

This lie will mislead neither the class-conscious workers nor the class-conscious soldiers.

A LEAGUE OF FALSEHOOD

ONE of the methods which the bourgeois press of every country employs with unerring effect is this—they lie, they scream, they clamour, they reiterate falsehoods persistently—“something may stick,” they hope.

“Lenin vociferates in Kshesinskaia’s palace for all he is worth,” writes the *Riech*. “Lenin addresses a gathering from the roof of the *Modern*,”¹²² report a number of newspapers.

And all of this is untrue. Lenin was not present at the *Modern* meeting. Lenin has not vociferated, for so far he has read only *one* report before a gathering of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks,¹²³ and published a series of short articles in the small newspaper *Pravda*.

It is the capitalists and the capitalist press who are vociferating for all they are worth, who are trying to drown the truth, to prevent it from being heard, to drown it in a torrent of vituperation and abuse, to prevent an earnest elucidation of the facts.

This is the true aim of all the efforts of the capitalists at the present moment as well as of those woe-Socialists who, like Mr. Plekhanov, have completely deserted to the capitalist side.

In to-day’s editorial, meant to be of “especial national importance,” the *Riech* again fulminates against the “preaching of anarchy,” and while doing so, most strikingly confutes itself. This is clear to any one who ponders the things he reads.

“. . . The great revolution has completely swept away the old organisation of power. . . .” Untrue. Not completely, far from it. “It can be restored only by a change in the people’s psychology (in a broad sense of the word),—or rather, by a new psychology which recognises the necessity of power and the duty of submission.”

Here you have before you a manifest lie, an obvious league of falsehood entered into by the capitalists, on the one hand, and the Plekhanovs, the Cherevanins and Co., who are shouting about anarchy, on the other.

In science as well as in practical and every-day conversation it is accepted without debate that Anarchism means the *negation of the state* for the transition period from capitalism to Socialism.

That Socialism leads to the "withering away" of the state is one of the tenets of Marxism. The Miliukovs, the Plekhanovs, the Cherevanins and the others, united in falsehood, know it quite well.

Do the Pravdists and Lenin deny the necessity *of the state now?* Do they deny the necessity of an "organisation of power," the "duty of submission" to it?

All literate people, with the exception of the league of liars, know perfectly well that they do not.

Both the *Pravda* and Lenin have stated most clearly and repeatedly that all of us are unreservedly in favour of the existence of the state and of an organisation of power not only for the time being, but also during the coming historic period when the transition from capitalism to Socialism will take place.

Only the league of falsehood can deny it, or fail to see it.

The question is *what "organisation of power" we propose to the people?*

Not the old organisation of power, not the police, not the bureaucracy, not the standing army, but a new organisation—The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', etc., Deputies.

Such Soviets already exist, having been brought forth by the revolution, they are already *recognised* by every one, even by the capitalist government, *as a semi-government*.

And we have made it even more than clear that *such* Soviets are the *only possible* form our revolutionary government can assume.

Can there be anything less ambiguous?

Since it is the "only possible" form, it means that we must act through propaganda only, unless some one begins to practice violence upon the masses.

"The necessity of power and the duty of submission" are recognised by all the Pravdists, and are being preached to the people.

The Miliukovs, the Plekhanovs, the Cherevanins and Co. lie in order to conceal the truth from the people; lie in order to suppress the most important thing: the question of the class character of *any given* organisation of power.

This is the main point.

The capitalist regards the Soviets of Workers', etc., Deputies as *anarchy*, because such an organisation of power does not commit the people beforehand and unconditionally to capitalist subjection, but provides liberty and order together with the possibility of peaceful and gradual transition to Socialism.

This and only this makes the capitalists dissatisfied, indignant, and angry. Hence the league of falsehood. Hence the sea of calumny and the howl of anger. Hence, the covert, insidious incitement to pogroms to which the *Riech* resorts in the above-mentioned editorial when it appeals to "counteraction," to "renunciation of passivity, indifference," etc.

If you, gentlemen, have the majority of the people with you, if your alliance with the Soviets is lasting (and we frankly admit that at the present moment the majority in the Soviets is not with us), then what do you fear, gentlemen, why do you lie?

All we want is to *make clear* to the workers and to the poorest peasants the errors of their tactics. We recognize the *Soviets* as the only possible power. We advocate the necessity of power and the duty of submitting to it.

Why, then, are you afraid? Why do you lie?

It is the truth that you fear. You lie in order to *suppress* with the aid of pogrom makers, slander, violence, and filth, any chance of *expounding* the truth.

This has been discerned even by some of our opponents. Read to-day's *Dielo Naroda*,¹²⁴ organ of the Socialists-Revolutionists, an organ to which Minister Kerensky contributes.

This is what that organ says about Plekhanov, the most trustworthy ally of the *Russkaia Volia* and the *Riech*:

"... Such words and such methods of struggle we have been accustomed to see on the pages of the *Russkaia Volia*. To see them employed in articles written by Socialists is, frankly speaking, painful and depressing. . . ."

Thus write our opponents.

Thus write democrats whose democratic conscience has been awakened.

To shame the Miliukovs, the Plekhanovs and the Cherevanins is a hopeless task. But when even a newspaper to which Kerensky is a contributor turns with disgust from the madly chauvinistic, slanderously filthy, pogrom-inciting methods employed by Plekhanov, then we may safely say:

They are dead people, the heroes of such methods.

BANKS AND MINISTERS

N. POKROVSKY, the former Minister of Foreign Affairs and the present Vice-Chairman of the War Industries Central Committee, has become a member of the board of the Russian Bank for Foreign Commerce. Count V. N. Kokovtsev, the former Chairman of the Council of Ministers, is also to become a member of the board.

These happy tidings were brought to us by last night's papers.

A Minister to-day, a banker to-morrow; a banker to-day, a Minister to-morrow. But for "war to the end"—both to-day and to-morrow.

This state of affairs prevails not only in Russia, but also in every other country where capital rules. The war is enriching a handful of bankers who have the whole world in their grip.

We may be told that Pokrovsky and Kokovtsev were Ministers during the old régime, and that we are now living in a regenerated Russia.

We will answer with a question:

And what about the present Ministers, Guchkov, Tereshchenko, and Konovalov; in how many banks are they interested as directors, shareholders, or actual owners?

Those of our comrades who are bank employés (who, by the way, should organise a union of their own as soon as possible) would do well to gather material on this subject and publish it in the labour press.

Pravda, No. 32, April 27, 1917.

AN IMPORTANT EXPOSE

IN to-day's editorial of the *Dielo Naroda*, a newspaper with which Minister Kerensky, we are told, is very closely associated, we read the direct statement that "according to information received by us, the *Dielo Naroda*, from people whom we consider adequately competent in this matter, the above-mentioned note" (namely, the note pertaining to the renunciation of the policy of annexations and indemnities) "has not yet been sent."¹²⁵

Thus, members and adherents of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies who say and think that "we have forced the government to renounce annexations" are mistaken.

Comrades and citizens! Read and reread the above-quoted statement of the *Dielo Naroda*, ponder its meaning!

The editorial further says:

And here Mr. Guchkov, echoing the opinion of his bellicose colleague in the Palace Square who covets and lusts after Constantinople and the Straits, in his appeal to the army on the Rumanian front, is hurling slogans about the need of completely smashing Germany and Austria. . . .

If the *Dielo Naroda* knows that Miliukov covets and lusts after annexations, then why not tell us a little more about it? Does not the people's cause require that the *People's Cause** speak more clearly and more frankly?

The editorial closes by calling attention to the "militarist group in our Provisional Government."

Once more: Does not the people's cause require that the *People's Cause* make known names and facts, facts and names?

Pravda, No. 32, April 27, 1917.

* A play on words: *Dielo Naroda* means the people's cause.—*Ed.*

TO THE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS¹²⁸

COMRADES, Soldiers! Comrades, Sailors!

The capitalist newspapers, from the *Riech* down to the *Russkaia Volia*, are carrying on a most shameless campaign of falsehood and slander concerning the passage through Germany of myself and thirty other emigrants.

The capitalist newspapers shamelessly lie, when they assert or insinuate that we have availed ourselves of certain inadmissible or extraordinary favours from the German Government, a government which we consider just as predatory, just as criminal, as are all the capitalist governments that are carrying on the present war.

Rich people who had "connections" with the high officials of the tsarist monarchy, such as the liberal professor Kovalevsky, the friend of the Miliukovs, *et al.*, for example, have continually negotiated with the German Government through the agency of the tsarist Russian Government with a view to arranging for an exchange of Russians captured by the Germans, for Germans captured by the Russians.

Why then should the emigrants, who languished abroad because of their struggle against the Tsar, not have the right to arrange for an exchange of Russians for Germans without the government's aid?

Why has the government of Miliukov, *et al.*, not admitted into Russia Fritz Platten, the Swiss Socialist, who travelled with us and who had negotiated the agreement with the German Government concerning the exchange?

The government lies when it spreads rumours that Platten is a friend of the Germans. This is pure slander. Platten is the friend of the workers and the enemy of the capitalists of all countries.

The capitalists lie when they circulate rumours that we are for a separate peace with the Germans, that we conferred or wanted to confer in Stockholm with those among the German Socialists who sided with their government.

This is a lie and a calumny. We did not participate and shall not participate in any conferences with such Socialists. We regard

the Socialists of all countries who are helping their respective capitalists to carry on this criminal war, as traitors to the cause of Socialism.

Only those Socialists are our friends, who, like Karl Liebknecht, condemned to hard labour by the predatory German government, rise against their own capitalists.

We do not want a separate peace with Germany, we want peace among all the peoples, we want the victory of the workers of all the countries over the capitalists of all countries.

The Russian capitalists are lying about us and are slandering us, just as the German capitalists are slandering Liebknecht. The capitalists lie when they say that we want discord and hostility to exist between the workers and the soldiers.

This is not true! We want the workers and the soldiers to unite. We want to make it clear to the members of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies that it is the Soviets that must have the full state power.

The capitalists are traducing us. They have sunk to such shamelessness that not one bourgeois newspaper has reprinted from the *Izvestia* our report pertaining to our journey and the decision of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Every worker and every soldier knows his Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. It was to the Executive Committee of this Soviet that we made our report on the day following our arrival. The report appeared in the *Izvestia*.¹²⁷ Why has not a single capitalist paper reprinted this report?

Because these papers are spreading lies and slanders and are afraid lest our report to the Executive Committee should expose the deceivers.

Why has not one paper reprinted the decision of the Executive Committee concerning our report, the decision which was published in the same issue of the *Izvestia*?

Because this decision exposes the lies of the capitalists and their newspapers, in that it demands that the government take steps for the return of the emigrants.

The Soviet *Izvestia* has published a protest against Trotsky's arrest by the English; it has published a letter by Zurabov exposing Miliukov's lies; it has also published a telegram from Martov¹²⁸ on the same subject.

Soldiers and Sailors! Do not believe the lies and the slanders of the capitalists! Expose the deceivers, who keep silent about the truth published in the *Izvestia!*

Written about April 24-27, 1917.

First published in the *Lenin Collection*, Vol. IV, 1925.

AGAINST THE POGROM MAKERS ¹²⁸

To the workers, the soldiers, and all the inhabitants of Petrograd! Citizens! The paper *Russkaia Volia*, founded by the Tsar's Minister Protopenov and despised even by the Cadets, is inciting to a pogrom against our party, against the paper *Pravda*, against our comrades Lenin and Zinoviev, against the Petrograd Committee of our party located in Kshesinskaia's palace. We have had a number of communications, oral as well as written, regarding threats of violence, bombing, etc.

Since the very first days of the revolution, the capitalists, masking as "republicans," have been trying to sow hostility between the workers and the soldiers. First they lied about the workers wanting to deprive the army of bread. Now they are trying to incite against the *Pravda*.

We are appealing to the sense of honour of the revolutionary workers and soldiers of Petrograd, and we declare:

We not only have not been guilty of any direct or indirect threats of violence against any individual but, on the contrary, we have always maintained that our task consists in explaining our views to all the people, in explaining why we regard the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, elected by all the workers and the soldiers, as the only revolutionary government possible.

On the very first day of their arrival the comrades, members of various parties, who passed through Germany, made a report to people trusted by all the workers and the soldiers, namely, to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Chkhheidze, Tsereteli, Skobelev, Steklov, and others were members of this Executive Committee.

Comrades! Those leaders of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies differ with us on many questions pertaining to the organisation of the state. They could not have acted out of friendship for us. Now what did the Executive Committee do?

It published in its *Izvestia*, No. 32, April 5, 1917, the full report dealing with the passage through Germany.

This report gives all the facts, as well as the names of the foreign

Socialists from two neutral countries, Switzerland and Sweden, who checked up our minutes.

And what was the decision of the Executive Committee? Did it express its condemnation of or even dissatisfaction with the passage of Lenin and others through Germany?

No. Here is how the editors of the *Izvestia* in the same issue of the paper worded the decision of the Executive Committee:

Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to apply immediately to the Provisional Government and to take measures looking toward the immediate admission into Russia of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude toward the war. The results of the negotiations with the government will be published in the near future.—Editors.

Any one can see, that not a single word is said here against Lenin and his comrades. Rather the Provisional Government is being cautioned and it is decided to take measures so that it may not hinder admission into Russia.

The telegram of Martov and the arrest of Trotsky by the English after that prove that Miliukov is powerless against England and France who keep imprisoned their own Socialist-internationalists, or that Miliukov does not want to take serious measures.

Throughout the war the exchange of Germans for Russians has taken place repeatedly. Kovalevsky, member of the State Council, was returned in exchange for an Austrian, etc. For the rich such exchanges have been arranged by the governments many a time. Why then does not the present government want to arrange such an exchange for the emigrants? Because it wants to deprive a number of fighters of a chance to participate in the revolutionary struggle.

What does the *Russkaia Volia*, or papers that follow in its footsteps, like the *Riech* and the *Yedinstvo*, do?

They continue their baiting, thereby inciting ignorant people to violence upon individuals, while they refrain from publishing either the report or the decision of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has been furnished the names of a number of Socialists who have verified and approved every step taken by the emigrants in connection with the journey. Those are the French Socialists Loriot and Guilbeaux, the Swiss Socialist Platten; the Swedish Socialists Lindhagen (Mayor of Stockholm), Carlson, Ström, Nerman;

the German Socialist of the Karl Liebknecht group, Hartstein; the Polish Socialist Bronski.

Such conduct of the *Russkaia Volia*, the *Riech* and the *Yedinstvo* is aiding and abetting the dark forces that threaten violence, bombs, and pogroms.

Comrades, soldiers and workers!

We warn you against these gentlemen of the *Russkaia Volia*, the *Riech* and the *Yedinstvo*, and we declare over and over again: we stand for explaining to all the people the views of all the parties, we stand for respecting the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies.

If the Provisional Government, if the *Riech*, if Mr. Plekhanov are dissatisfied with the conduct of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, why do they not state so openly! Why do they not demand a re-examination of the case? Why are they afraid to reprint what was published in No. 32 of the *Izvestia*? Why? Because their aim is to sow discord!

If violence, in one form or another, is resorted to, we shall place the responsibility on the editors and contributors of the *Russkaia Volia*, the *Riech*, the *Yedinstvo*, etc., who have dared to refrain from publishing the report and the decision of the Executive Committee, and to carry on an insidious propaganda.

The paper *Dielo Naroda*, in which Minister A. F. Kerensky is taking an active part, has already pointed out that the methods of the above-named newspapers are helping the pogrom makers (*Dielo Naroda*, No. 23).

We want the Miliukovs, Amfiteatros, Plekhanovs, and Co. to know that if as a result of their baiting violence is resorted to it will recoil first of all on themselves.

Down with the pogrom agitation! Down with the heroes of baiting and deception, who suppress the decisions of the Executive Committee!

Comrades, soldiers and workers! You will not allow the freedom of the people to be blackened by pogroms! You will see to it that the decisions of your Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies are *respected*.

Central Committee of R.S.-D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee of R.S.-D.L.P.

Written April 27, 1917.

Published in the *Pravda*, No. 33, April 28, 1917.

CITIZENS! UNDERSTAND THE NATURE OF THE METHODS USED BY THE CAPITALISTS OF ALL COUNTRIES

To-day's *Riech* concludes its editorial with the following words:

The German Government is endeavouring to preserve unity within Germany and to create discord among the Allies. Our "Pravdists" are making every effort to undermine unity in revolutionary Russia and to set the Russian Government upon the governments of our allies, England and France. Are we then not justified in saying that the Lenin crew is working for von Bethmann-Hollweg and Wilhelm II?

No, Messrs. capitalists, you are not justified in saying it. It is the Pravdists, and we alone, that are not only not preserving inner unity in Germany, but are, *on the contrary, actually engaged in destroying it.*

This is a fact that no lies of the Russian capitalists can ever obliterate.

It is a fact that we, the Pravdists, and we alone, demand the unconditional and immediate breaking away of the German Socialists from the German Plekhanovs, *i. e.*, the Scheidemanns, and from the German "centre," *i. e.*, the people who vacillate, who do not dare to break away, definitely, on principle, from the Scheidemanns.

It is a fact that we, the Pravdists, and we alone, advocate unity with only two German Socialist groups (the "Spartacus" and the "Arbeiterpolitik") which share the ideas of Karl Liebknecht, *i. e.*, which advocate the destruction of inner unity in Germany. The policy of Karl Liebknecht, a policy of deeds, not words, is to destroy the "unity" between the capitalists and the workers of Germany.

Clearly realising that the German capitalists and their Wilhelm are imperialists, *i. e.*, robbers, Karl Liebknecht as far back as September, 1915, despatched a letter to the Zimmerwald Conference, which was never published, because Liebknecht was then still a legal person, but which was known to every one present at Zimmerwald.

That letter called not for civil truce, but for civil war.

This is how our comrade Karl Liebknecht preached "inner unity" in Germany. This is what we ourselves have preached in the

German translation of our Pravdist brochure *Socialism and the War* (Zinoviev and Lenin).*

Karl Liebknecht not only spoke this way, he acted accordingly. From the platform of the German parliament, he called upon the German soldiers to turn their weapons against their own German government. Then he joined a street demonstration with revolutionary proclamations reading: "Down with the Government!"

This is how Karl Liebknecht, an adherent of our Pravdist policy, has been "endeavouring to preserve unity within Germany." This is why he is languishing in prison now.

And Karl Liebknecht is denounced as a Judas and a traitor not only by the entire press of the German capitalists, but also by all the papers of the German Plekhanovs who accuse him more or less directly of treason or Anarchism.

In every country the capitalists are pouring oceans of lies, calumnies, vilifications and accusations of treason upon those Socialists who are behaving as Karl Liebknecht is behaving in Germany, or as the Pravdists are behaving in Russia, i. e., who are destroying the "inner unity" between the workers and the capitalists, the workers and the Plekhanovs, the workers and the "centrists" of each country, and who are creating unity among the workers of all countries in order to make an end of the predatory, murderous, imperialist war, in order to rid mankind of the yoke of capitalism.

In Germany the capitalists are baiting as traitors Karl Liebknecht and his friends. In Germany, too, our comrade Karl Liebknecht has been repeatedly threatened with mob violence. This has been mentioned even by the German Plekhanov, the social-chauvinist David. In Russia the capitalists bait the Pravdists as traitors. In England the capitalists bait the Scotch public school teacher Mac-Lean as a traitor. The latter is languishing in prison for the same kind of crime, for the same kind of "treason" as that of which Karl Liebknecht and we, the Pravdists, are guilty.

In France the capitalist-republican government is keeping in prison the Frenchman Contant and the Russian Raiev for issuing a proclamation entitled "Through Force Shall Thou Obtain Peace."

Gentlemen of the *Riech*, Messrs. Ministers, gentlemen of the revolutionary government, put us, Pravdists, in prison, or suggest to the Russian people that it put us in prison! Thus you will be following in the footsteps of capitalistic England, our ally (or of

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII.—Ed.

Tsar Nicholas II, for it was he who concluded the treaty with the Allies), which is keeping in prison the English Pravdists.

Down with "inner unity" between workers and capitalists in all countries, for this "unity" has condemned and is still condemning humanity to the horrors of the predatory, imperialist war waged in the interests of the capitalists!

Long live unity among those Socialists and workers in all the countries who not only sympathise with Karl Liebknecht verbally, but who also carry out the Liebknecht policy against their own capitalists!

Pravda, No. 33, April 28, 1917.

"VOLUNTARY AGREEMENT" BETWEEN LANDOWNERS AND PEASANTS?

HERE is the text of the telegram from Minister Shingarev, mentioned in yesterday's editorial of our paper, and printed in to-day's *Dien*:

Having learned of the decision of the Ranenburg Committee relating to the grain sowing, I regard it as my duty to declare that an independent solution of the land question in the absence of a general state law is inadmissible. Arbitrary action will lead to a national calamity and will jeopardise the cause of freedom by provoking discord. The lawful solution of the land question is the business of the Constituent Assembly. Pending that, there will be formed in each locality as adjuncts of the volost * supply committees agricultural chambers of conciliation for the purpose of effecting voluntary agreements between the tillers of the land and the landowners. The question of leaseholds on vacant lands is also being speedily considered. In the name of general order I request that everybody be guided by the decisions of the Provisional Government and refrain from arbitrarily establishing would-be laws.

Does it look like "democracy," like "people's freedom," when the peasants, who admittedly constitute a large, an overwhelming majority of the population, have no right to adopt and carry out their own decision, but must wait for "a voluntary agreement" between the agricultural workers and the landowners?

One landowner having two thousand desiatinas of land,—and three hundred peasant families having two thousand desiatinas of land. This is how the matter stands in Russia as a whole. Three hundred peasants must wait for the "voluntary" agreement of one landowner!!

Is this right, comrade soldiers?

Pravda, No. 33, April 28, 1917.

* Volost—an administrative unit comprising several villages.—*Ed.*

AN HONEST VOICE IN A CHORUS OF SLANDERERS

*Malenkaia Gazeta*¹³⁰ publishes to-day an appeal of a group of soldiers of the Fourth Front Line Sanitary Automobile Unit to all comrades in the army. They demand an investigation of the circumstances connected with the passage through Germany of Lenin and others.

Here is an honest voice rising above the flood of base lies, foul slander, and pogrom agitation. Indeed, every citizen has a right and a duty to demand an investigation into any fact that is of social importance.

Here is an honest method of honest people, not of pogrom-makers.

This is the very method which Lenin and all *the adherents of various other parties* who had come with him employed immediately upon their arrival. They presented a *report* of their passage to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; in their report they gave the *names* of Socialists from two neutral countries, Switzerland and Sweden, who had signed the official log of the journey, and had examined *all* the documents. Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Skobelev, Steklov, and others were members of the Executive Committee. They decided to publish both the report, and the decision of the Executive Committee, in the *Izvestia*.

Following the consideration of the report it was resolved: "Having heard the report of Comrades Zurabov and Zinoviev, the Executive Committee decided to apply immediately to the Provisional Government and to take measures looking toward the immediate admission into Russia of all emigrants, irrespective of their political views and their attitude toward the war."

Both documents were published in the *Izvestia*, No. 32, April 5, 1917.

Is it fair, is it sensible *not* to reprint the report and the resolution, and to conduct a pogrom agitation?

Have the comrades of the Fourth Front Line Sanitary Automobile Unit acted right by hastening to "brand" and to "denounce" the newly arrived as "traitors," by hurling "anathemas" at them, and by reviling them otherwise before considering the documents printed in the *Izvestia*?

Is this not precisely what is meant by Anarchism, an appeal not to respect the members of the Executive Committee elected by the workers and soldiers?

N. LENIN.

Pravda, No. 33, April 28, 1917.

THE SOLDIERS AND THE LAND

THE majority of the soldiers come from the peasantry. Every peasant knows how the landowners have oppressed and are oppressing the people. But wherein lies the power of the landowners?

In the land.

The landowners have tens of millions of desiatinas of land. That is why nothing remains for millions of peasant families but to enslave themselves to the landowners.

No "liberties" can help the peasants while the landowners are in possession of tens of millions of desiatinas of land.

It is necessary that all the lands of the landowners be taken over by the people. It is necessary that all the land in the country become the property of the people, and its administration be placed in the hands of the local Soviets of Peasants' and Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

How is this to be accomplished? We must forthwith form all over Russia, in every village, without exception, local Soviets of Peasants' and Agricultural Labourers' Deputies modeled after the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in the cities. If the peasants and agricultural workers will not unite *of their own accord*, if they themselves will not take their fate into their own hands, then no one in this world can help them, no one can free them from their bondage to the landowners.

But in order to be able to seize immediately the entire land of the landowners in their own districts and to manage it efficiently, preserving perfect order, and guarding against any damage to property,—the peasants must be supported by the soldiers.

The peasants, workers, and soldiers constitute the overwhelming majority of the people. This majority *wants* the land to be placed immediately in the hands of the Soviets of Peasant Deputies. No one can stop the majority, *if* it is well organised (banded together, united), *if* it is class-conscious, *if* it is armed.

Soldiers! Help to unite and arm all the workers and the peasants!

Soldiers! You, too, unite more solidly, and form closer ties with

the workers and the peasants! Do not let anybody take away your armed power!

Then, and only then, will the people be able to obtain the land, and free itself from its bondage to the landowners.

N. LENIN.

Soldatskaia Pravda, No. 1, April 28, 1917.

THE PETROGRAD CITY CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN
SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY
FROM APRIL 27 TO MAY 5, 1917¹⁸¹

First published in 1925 in *The Petrograd City Conference and the All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, April [May], 1917.* (In Russian.)

THE PETROGRAD CITY CONFERENCE OF THE R. S.-D. L. P.

I

REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT, APRIL 27, 1917

WE worked out our political line earlier and with more precision than other parties. This line is expressed in resolutions. Life, however, has furnished us with an entirely new situation. The chief mistake which revolutionists make is that they look back to the revolutions of the past. Life presents a great deal which is new and which must be included in the general sequence of events.

The motive forces of the revolution we have defined quite correctly. Events have justified our old Bolshevik premises, but the trouble is that the comrades have wished to remain "old" Bolsheviks. Mass movement was confined to the proletariat and the peasantry. The West-European bourgeoisie had always been opposed to revolution. Such was the situation to which we were accustomed. But it has turned out differently. The imperialist war has split the European bourgeoisie, and this has created a situation where the Anglo-French capitalists, for imperialist reasons, began to favour a Russian revolution. The English capitalists actually entered into a conspiracy with Guchkov, Miliukov, and the high commanding officers of the army. The Anglo-French capitalists are siding with the revolution. The European newspapers report many instances of English and French emissaries journeying to carry on negotiations with "revolutionists" like Guchkov. The revolution has thus gained an unexpected ally. As a result, the revolution has turned out to be different from what any one expected. We have found allies not only in the Russian bourgeoisie but also among the Anglo-French capitalists. When I mentioned this in the course of an address delivered abroad,* I was told by a Menshevik, that we were wrong, for events had proved, so he said, that the bourgeoisie was needed for the success of the revolution. I replied that it was "needed" only to the extent that it helped the revolution triumph in eight days.

* See p. 77 of this book.—*Ed.*

Did not Miliukov declare even before the revolution that if victory were to be attained through revolution, then he was against victory? We must not forget these words of Miliukov.

And so, the revolution in its first stage developed in a way that no one had expected. The Bolsheviks' reply to the question as to the possibility of "national defence" was as follows: Should the bourgeois-chauvinist revolution triumph (No. 47 of the *Social-Democrat*),* national defence would become impossible. The uniqueness of the situation is in the dual power that now exists. Abroad, where not a single paper more radical than the *Riech* ever penetrates, and where the Anglo-French bourgeois papers speak of the all-powerful Provisional Government and the "chaos" represented by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, nobody has any clear conception of this dual power. Only here on the spot have we learned that the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has surrendered its power to the Provisional Government. The Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies represents the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the soldiers; among the latter the majority are peasants. It is therefore a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants. But this "dictatorship" has entered into an agreement with the bourgeoisie. And here it is where the "old" Bolshevism is in need of revision. The situation that has come about indicates that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants is interlocked with the power of the bourgeoisie. A most amazingly unique situation. The past contains no instances of a revolution where the representatives of the revolutionary proletariat and peasantry, though fully armed, concluded an alliance with the bourgeoisie, though having power, ceded it to the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie controls the power of capital and the power of organisation. It is to be marvelled at that the workers have shown themselves to be as well organised as they have. The bourgeois revolution in Russia has been completed in so far as power has come into the hands of the bourgeoisie. Here the "old Bolsheviks" rebut: "It has not been completed,—for there is no dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants." But the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies represents that very dictatorship.

The agrarian movement can proceed in two ways. The peasants may take the land, but no struggle may develop between the village

*See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, Article, "A Few Theses. The Editors."—Ed.

proletariat and the prosperous peasant. Though this is not very likely, for the class-struggle does not wait. To repeat now what we said in 1905, and omit mention of the class-struggle in the village, is treason to the proletarian cause.

Already, we can discern in the decisions of a number of peasant congresses a tendency to wait with the solution of the agrarian question until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly,—this represents a victory for the prosperous peasantry which leans towards the Cadets. The peasants, however, are seizing the land. The Socialists-Revolutionists are restraining them, suggesting that they wait for the Constituent Assembly. We must combine the demand for the immediate seizure of the land with propaganda for the creation of Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. The bourgeois democratic revolution has been completed. The agrarian programme must be carried out in a new way. The same struggle for power between the large and the petty proprietors that is taking place here will occur in the village. The peasants will not be satisfied with land alone. The number of horseless peasants has increased greatly. We, alone, are at present stimulating the development of the agrarian revolution, when we tell the peasants to take the land immediately. The land must be taken in an organised manner. Property must not be damaged. The agrarian movement is, thus, only an anticipation, and not a fact. It is the task of Marxists to make the question of an agrarian programme clear to the peasants; it is necessary to shift its centre of gravity to a Soviet of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. However, we must be prepared for a situation where the peasantry may unite with the bourgeoisie, just as the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has done. It follows that the agrarian movement still must be developed. The prosperous peasantry will, naturally, gravitate towards the bourgeoisie, towards the Provisional Government. It may prove even more conservative than Guchkov.

For the time being, the victory of bourgeois power has been attained. The economic position of the peasants separates them from the landowners. What the peasants need is not a legal claim to the land. They need Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies. Those who advise the peasants to wait for the Constituent Assembly are deceiving them.

Our task is to draw a line of class demarcation through the petty-bourgeois bog. The bourgeoisie does its work excellently, making

all sorts of promises, but carrying into effect only its class policy.

In the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies the correlation is such that power is transferred to the Provisional Government, while the Socialists content themselves with "contact commissions." True, this government is composed of the most trusted and best people of their class, but still of a definite class. The petty bourgeoisie has completely surrendered to them. If we do not mark out a proletarian line, we shall betray the cause of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie rules either by deception or by violence. At the present moment flattery and deception prevail, and this lulls the revolution to sleep. In matters of secondary importance they do make concessions. But in matters of prime importance (the agrarian revolution, for example), they do nothing. He who does not see that in Russia, outside of the Bolshevik ranks, there is nothing but revolutionary defencism, and that it has triumphed everywhere, cannot see the facts. Revolutionary defencism means the surrender of all Socialist principles for the sake of the predatory interests of large capital; hidden behind the phrase "national defence," it means the surrender of the position to the petty bourgeoisie. When I spoke of the "conscientious" mass of revolutionary defencists, I had in mind not a moral category, but a class definition. The class represented in the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is not interested in predatory war. In Europe it is different. There the people are oppressed, the most opportunistic pacifists are not infrequently baited even more than we, the Pravdists. Here the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies carries its policy of revolutionary defencism into effect, not by violence, but because the masses trust it. Europe is one large military prison. Capital rules cruelly there. All over Europe the bourgeoisie should be overthrown, and not argued with. In Russia the soldiers are armed; they allowed the bourgeoisie to beguile them peacefully when they agreed ostensibly only to "defend themselves" against Wilhelm. In Europe, there is no "conscientious" revolutionary defencism, of the sort we have in Russia, where the people have handed over the power to the bourgeoisie, because of ignorance, inertia, the habit to suffer the rod, tradition. Steklov, Chkheidze, nominally leaders, in reality are appendages of the bourgeoisie; despite their virtues, their knowledge of Marxism, etc., they are politically dead. Here the power is in the hands of the soldiers, who incline towards defencism. The objective class position of the capitalists is one thing. They fight for themselves. The

soldiers are proletarians and peasants. This is another thing. Are they interested in seizing Constantinople? No, their class interests are against war! That is why they can be enlightened, their minds can be changed. The crux of the political situation of the present moment is to be able to make the truth clear to the masses. We cannot regard ourselves as "leaning upon" the revolutionary masses, etc., until we have explained to the soldiers or to the un-educated masses the meaning of the slogan "Down with war."

What is the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies? Its class significance is direct power. Complete political freedom, we have not of course. But nowhere else is there such freedom as exists in Russia. "Down with war" does not mean to fling the bayonet away. It means the passing of power to another class. The thing on which all our present efforts must be concentrated is to explain that. Blanquism consisted in an effort to seize power by relying on the support of a minority. With us it is quite different. We are as yet a minority, we realise the need of winning a majority. Unlike the Anarchists, we need the state for the transition to Socialism. The Paris Commune furnished an example of a state of the type of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, an example of direct power held by organised and armed workers, an example of the dictatorship of workers and peasants. The rôle of the Soviets, the import of such a dictatorship, is in applying organised force against the counter-revolution, in safeguarding the conquests of the revolution for the benefit of the majority and with the support of the majority. There can be no dual power in a state. The Soviets of Deputies represent a type of state where the existence of a police is impossible. Here the people are their own rulers, and a return to monarchy is impossible. The army and the people must merge into one—therein lies the triumph of liberty! Every one must be in possession of arms. To retain freedom, a universal arming of the people is indispensable. This is the essence of the commune. We are not Anarchists who deny organised government, *i. e.*, force in general, particularly a state maintained by the organised and armed workers themselves through the Soviets. Life has interlocked the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry with the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The next stage is the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the proletariat is not yet sufficiently organised and enlightened; it must be enlightened. Such Soviets of Workers', Peasants', etc., Deputies should be organised all over the

country,—life demands it. There is no other way. This is the Paris Commune! The Soviet of Workers' Deputies is not a trade union as the bourgeoisie would like it to be. The people view it differently and more correctly: the people regard it as a government power. In the triumph of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, they see a way out of the war. This is the type of government under which it is possible to advance toward Socialism. Should a group seize power, it would not mean much. The Russian Revolution has risen higher: any government other than the Soviet is impossible, and this is what the bourgeoisie fears. As long as the Soviets have not assumed power, we will not seize it. A living force, however, must impel the Soviets to seize power. Otherwise we shall never get out of the war which the capitalists are carrying on by deceiving the people. All countries are on the brink of ruin; we ought to realise this; there is no way out except through a Socialist revolution. The government must be overthrown, but not everybody has a clear understanding of it. If the power of the Provisional Government rests on the Soviet of Workers' Deputies then you cannot "just" overthrow it. The only way it can and must be overthrown is by winning over the majority in the Soviets. Either we go forward toward the full power of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or we go back to the imperialist war,—there is no other alternative. Kautsky denied the possibility of a revolution in time of war. Life has shown him to be wrong.

As regards the nationalisation of the banks and their control,—economically it is feasible, economically nothing can interfere with it, once power is in the hands of the workers. It is clear, then, that viewing the problems of the proletariat as we do, it is idle to talk about alliances with the "defencists."

Concerning a new name for the party: the name "Social-Democrat" is incorrect; it is scientifically wrong. Marx and Engels admitted this on many occasions. If they "tolerated" the use of the word, it was because after the year 1871 a special situation was created: a slow preparation of the masses was needed, revolution was not on the order of the day. Democracy, too, means state power, but already the Paris Commune rose above it. Now the whole world is facing in a practical way the question of transition to Socialism. The Social-Democrat Plekhanov and the rest of the social-chauvinists throughout the world have betrayed Socialism. We should call ourselves the "Communist Party."

II

CONCLUDING REMARKS CONCERNING THE REPORT ON THE
POLITICAL SITUATION, APRIL 27, 1917

THE discussion has disclosed divergence of opinion. I cannot answer all the questions.¹²²

As regards old Bolshevism: Kalinin defended old Bolshevism. But he also came to the conclusion that our present tactics are correct. In another opinion, a deviation towards the tactics of the petty bourgeoisie became most manifest.

An ancient expression: to carry the revolution to its completion; but which revolution? The objective situation of 1905 was as follows: the proletariat and the peasantry constituted the only revolutionary element, while the Cadets stood for the monarchy. Now defencism represents the adoption by the peasants of petty-bourgeois tactics. Under the circumstances, the idea of carrying the revolution to completion has no meaning. The revolution has united the petty bourgeoisie with other revolutionary elements upon the ground of defencism.

On the future of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry: a petty-bourgeois peasantry holding to the defencist point of view may even be in favour of a monarchy.

A new line follows from the policy of Bolshevism. The petty bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie have combined. We proceed from conflicting class interests. The peasant labourers ought to be against the imperialist war. The peasant-proprietors are for defencism.

Defencism has shown that the petty bourgeoisie has deserted the working class and has gone over to the big bourgeoisie. The poor peasant who earns a part of his living in the city does not need this war. This class ought to be opposed to the war.

The old Bolshevism should be abandoned. We must draw a line of demarcation between the petty bourgeoisie and the wage-earning proletariat. Fine phrases about the revolutionary people are becoming to a man like Kerensky, but not to the revolutionary proletariat. To be revolutionists, even democrats, with Nicholas removed, is no great merit. Revolutionary democracy is good for nothing; it is nothing but a phrase. It covers up, it does not disclose, the conflicting character of class interests. A Bolshevik must open the workers' and the peasants' eyes to the existence of

these conflicts, not gloss over them. If the imperialist war continues to burden the proletariat and the peasants economically, then these classes will have to rebel against this war.

Our present task is to organise a network of Soviets of Soldiers', Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. The whole of Russia is already being covered with a network of organs for local self-government. A commune may exist also in the form of organs of self-government. The abolition of the police, of the standing army, universal arming—all this may be accomplished through organs of local self-government. I took the Soviet of Workers' Deputies as the starting point simply because it already exists.

It is said, we must "interest" the proletariat. This is done by Chkheidze, by the Provisional Government, and others, when they use high-sounding words about revolutionary democracy. A Bolshevik must differentiate between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie, and leave such words as "revolutionary democracy" and "revolutionary people" to Kerensky. Democracy in Russia is imperialist. It is argued that we are reducing our activities to cultural work. This is not true. Passing resolutions about the Constituent Assembly, etc.—that is what is meant by "interesting" the proletariat.

The real work is to bring about the abolition of the army, of the bureaucracy, of the police, and to arm the whole people.

The Constituent Assembly will not stifle the revolution, for we hear very little of it now, and no one is planning to convene it. We leave it to the Socialists-Revolutionists to "demand" its convocation.

This war is a world war. The war is waged by definite classes, and was brought on by bank capital. The way to stop it is to transfer power to another class. Peace, while power remains in the hands of the ruling classes, can change nothing.

The proletariat must be shown how the revolution can be carried forward by concrete measures. To carry the revolution forward, means to achieve self-government by self-willed action. The growth of democracy does not interfere with self-government, it helps us to realise our aims. The war can be terminated only by the transfer of power to another class—to which measure Russia has come closest—and certainly not by a truce concluded between the capitalists of the world on the basis of an exchange of throttled nationalities. A commune would suit the peasantry completely. A

commune means complete self-government, the absence of any supervision from above. Nine-tenths of the peasantry should favour it.

The bourgeoisie may become reconciled to the nationalisation of land, should the peasants seize the land. We, as a proletarian party, must maintain that land alone cannot relieve hunger. Consequently, to cultivate the land one will have to build the commune. We must be for centralisation, but there are times when the problem can best be solved on the spot, we should allow a maximum of initiative to the localities. The Cadets already behave like bureaucrats. They tell the peasants: "Wait for the Constituent Assembly." Only our party provides slogans that really carry the revolution forward. The Soviets of Workers' Deputies are fully capable of establishing communes in each locality. The question is whether the proletariat will be sufficiently organised for the task, but this we cannot calculate in advance, we must learn by doing.

Trotskyism: "No Tsar, but a workers' government." This, surely, is wrong. There is a petty bourgeoisie, it cannot be ignored. But it is made up of two groups. The poorer of the two is with the working class.

War. To terminate the war in a pacifist manner, is sheer Utopia. It may be terminated by an imperialist peace. But the masses do not want such a peace. War is a continuation of the policies of a class; to change the character of the war, one must change the class in power.

The name Communist Party is theoretically sound. The Left Socialists of other countries are too weak. We must take the initiative.

III

RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT¹⁸³

Whereas: (1) The Provisional Government, by its class character, is the organ of landowner and bourgeois domination; and,

Whereas: (2) The Provisional Government and the classes it represents are bound with indissoluble economic and political ties to Russian and Anglo-French imperialism; and,

Whereas: (3) The Provisional Government does not fully carry out even the programme which it has promulgated, and when it

does, it is only because of the pressure of the revolutionary proletariat and, partly, the petty bourgeoisie; and,

Whereas: (4) The forces of the bourgeois and feudal counter-revolution, now in the process of organisation, have already, under cover of the Provisional Government and with its obvious encouragement, launched an attack on revolutionary democracy; and,

Whereas: (5) The Provisional Government is postponing the calling of elections to the Constituent Assembly, is interfering with the general arming of the people, is opposing the transfer of the land to the people, is foisting upon it the landowners' way of settling the agrarian question, is blocking the introduction of the eight-hour workday, is condoning counter-revolutionary propaganda in the army by Guchkov and Co., is organising the high-commanding officers of the army against the soldiers, etc.; and,

Whereas: (6) The government, while doing this, is relying at the present moment on the confidence and, to a certain extent, on the actual consent of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which now comprises an undoubted majority of workers and soldiers, *i.e.*, peasants; and,

Whereas: (7) Each step made by the Provisional Government, both in the realm of its domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes not only of the city and village proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also of the petty bourgeoisie, to the real nature of this government;

The Conference resolves that:

(1) In order to accomplish the passing of state power into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or of other organs that are the direct expression of the will of the people, it is necessary to do extensive work in clarifying proletarian class consciousness and in uniting the city and the village proletarians against petty-bourgeois vacillation, for it is only work of this nature that will assure the successful advance of the whole revolutionary people; and that

(2) Such work requires comprehensive activity within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, an increase in the number of Soviets, an increase in their power, a welding together, within the Soviets, of the proletarian internationalist groups of our party; and

(3) We must organise more effectively our Social-Democratic forces, in order that we may direct the new wave of the revolutionary movement under the banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

IV

TWO REBUTTALS MADE DURING THE DISCUSSION OF THE RESOLUTION
ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE PROVISIONAL
GOVERNMENT, APRIL 28, 1917

1

AFTER yesterday's discussion I may confine myself to short remarks. The resolution indicates a way out. The situation is determined not only by the presence of representatives of certain classes in the membership of the Provisional Government, but also by the fact that the latter leans upon the Soviet of Workers' Deputies. It follows therefrom not that we must yield to the petty bourgeoisie, but that we must form independent groups, not in order to separate ourselves from the petty bourgeoisie, but in order to impel it to go forward. The seizure of all land is a progressive step of the revolutionary people. The replacement of the standing army by a militia is a forward move.

2

Comrade Kamenev is shifting to the policy of Chkheidze and Steklov.¹³⁴ Of course, no one will say that the Provisional Government is delaying the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, if we do not say it. Everybody wants to carry on the war. The point at issue is the organising of the counter-revolution. In revolutionary times control means deception. The date of elections could be fixed in three days. By enumerating the "sins," we supply precise data for propaganda. To seek the truth in the Contact Commission is impossible. There can be no control without power. To control by means of resolutions, etc., is pure nonsense. Control is dissipation of the petty-bourgeois illusion, fog.

V

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WAR¹³⁵

1

THE present war is, on the part of both belligerent groups, an imperialist war, i. e., it is waged by capitalists for domination over the world, for the division of spoils by capitalists, for profitable

markets for finance and bank capital, and for the strangulation of weak nationalities.

The passing of state power in Russia from Nicholas II to the government of Guchkov, Lvov and others, to the government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter this class character and meaning of Russia's participation in the war.

The fact that the new government is carrying on the same imperialist, *i. e.*, grabbing, predatory war, became particularly apparent when the government not only failed to publish the secret treaties concluded between the late Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of England, France, etc., but formally confirmed these treaties. This was done without consulting the will of the people and with the clear purpose of deceiving it, for it is well known that the treaties concluded by the late Tsar are predatory through and through, that they promise the Russian capitalists freedom to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc.

For this reason a proletarian party can support neither the present war, nor the present government, nor its loans, no matter in what glowing terms the loans may be spoken of, unless our party break completely with internationalism, *i. e.*, with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all lands in their struggle against the yoke of capital.

Nor can confidence be placed in the promise of the present government to renounce annexations, *i. e.*, conquest of foreign countries, or in the promise to renounce forcible retention within the confines of Russia of this or that nationality.

For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound by thousands of threads of Russian and Anglo-French bank capital, and intent on protecting the interests of capital, cannot renounce annexations in the present war without at the same time ceasing to be capitalists, without renouncing the profits on the billions invested in loans, in concessions, in war industries, etc. And, in the second place the new government, having renounced annexations in order to deceive the people, declared through Miliukov (Moscow, April 22, 1917), that it had no intentions of renouncing annexations. Finally, according to an exposé in the *Dielo Naroda*, a newspaper published with the collaboration of Minister Kerensky, Miliukov has not even sent abroad his statement concerning the renunciation of annexations.

In warning the people against the empty promises of the capitalists, the Conference therefore declares that it is necessary to dis-

tinguish sharply between a renunciation of annexations in words, and a renunciation of annexations in deed, *i. e.*, the immediate publication of all the secret, predatory treaties, of all notes and documents pertaining to foreign policy, and the taking of immediate steps to free all the peoples which the capitalist class, continuing the disgraceful policy of the late Tsar Nicholas II, oppresses, forcibly keeps bound to Russia, or keeps in a state of subjection.

2

The so-called “revolutionary defencism” which in Russia has permeated all the Narodnik parties (People’s Socialists, Trudoviks, Socialists-Revolutionists), as well as the opportunist party of the Social-Democratic Mensheviks (O. C., Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the unaffiliated revolutionists, represents, by its class character, on the one hand, the interests and the standpoint of the petty bourgeoisie, the petty proprietors, and the wealthier peasants, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples; on the other hand, it is the outcome of the deception of the masses by the capitalists, who refuse to make public the secret treaties and who try to get off with promises and rhetoric.

We are bound to admit that a very great number among the “revolutionary defencists” are honest, *i. e.*, they are honestly opposed to annexations, to conquests, to doing violence to weak peoples; they are honestly striving to attain a democratic and non-oppressive peace among all the belligerents. This cannot be denied, for the reason that the class position of the proletarians and the semi-proletarians of city and village (*i. e.*, of the people who earn their livelihood, wholly or partly, by selling their labour power to the capitalists) renders these classes indifferent to the profits of the capitalists.

Therefore, the conference, recognising any concessions to “revolutionary defencism” as absolutely not permissible and as actually signifying a complete break with internationalism and Socialism, declares at the same time that so long as the Russian capitalists and their Provisional Government confine themselves to threats of violence against the people (for example, Guchkov’s notorious decree threatening the soldiers with punishment for arbitrary removal of superiors), as long as the capitalists have not started the use of violence against the Soviets of Workers’, Soldiers’, Peasants’, Agricultural Workers’, and other Deputies which organise themselves freely, elect and remove all public officers freely,—so long will our party

preach general abstention from violence, at the same time fighting solely by means of comradely persuasion against the deep and fatal error of "revolutionary defencism," emphasising the truth that the attitude of uncritical confidence in the government of the capitalists, the bitterest enemies of peace and Socialism, is, in present-day Russia, the greatest obstacle to a speedy conclusion of the war.

3

As for the most important question of the manner of concluding as soon as possible, not by an oppressive peace, but by a truly democratic peace, this criminal, predatory, capitalist war that has brought mankind to the brink of ruin, hunger, and destruction, the Conference recognises and declares the following:

It is utterly senseless to presume that this war can be ended merely by a refusal of the soldiers of any one country to continue the war, merely by a one-sided cessation of war activities, merely by "sticking the bayonet into the ground."

Patiently, persistently, our party will explain to the people the truth that wars are being carried on by governments, that wars are indissolubly bound up with the policies of certain classes, and that, therefore, this war which has been started by the crowned murderers—monarchs such as Nicholas II, and by the uncrowned murderers—the capitalists, can be terminated with a truly democratic, non-oppressive peace only when the entire state power passes to the class that is not in the least interested in safeguarding capitalist profits, to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians which is really capable of putting an end to the bondage of capitalism.

Only this class is capable of actually renouncing annexations, of freeing itself from the meshes of finance and bank capital, of transforming, under certain circumstances, and not in words merely but in deed, this predatory war into a revolutionary-proletarian one, into a war aiming not to crush weak peoples, but rather to free the workers and peasants of the whole world from the yoke of capital.

The conference reiterates its protests against the base slander circulated by the capitalists against our party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be robbers no less than the capitalists of Russia, England, France, etc., and Emperor Wilhelm II to be a crowned murderer no less than Nicholas II and the monarchs of England, Italy, Rumania, and all the rest. We have proclaimed this view of

our party not only in Russian but also in German, in the translation of Lenin and Zinoviev's pamphlet *Socialism and the War*.*

Moreover, as editors of the central organ of our party, and in the name of the party, the above-named comrades had declared (*Social-Democrat*, Geneva, October 13, 1915, No. 47), that our party, if it were placed in power while the war was still raging, would forthwith propose to Germany, as well as to all the other peoples, an open, non-oppressive, *i. e.*, democratic peace, and that we, in case the German, English, French, and other capitalists declined such a peace, would ourselves start a revolutionary war, summoning the workers of all countries to join us.

The Conference ratifies this declaration in full.

The Conference takes cognisance of the fact that in no other bellicose country in the world can one find either such freedom as is found now in Russia, or such revolutionary mass organisations as one finds in the Russian Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', etc., Deputies; and that nowhere else in the world, therefore, can the transfer of state power to the actual majority of the people, *i. e.*, to the workers and poorest peasants, be achieved so easily.

The Conference declares that since the majority of the people, though enjoying complete freedom of agitation and propaganda, have not yet come to understand the inseparable connection between the present war and capitalist interests, there is left only one practical means of bringing a speedy end to the present butchery of peoples.

This means is fraternisation at the front.

The Conference calls attention to the fact that even the *Novoe Vremia*, this servile mouthpiece of the capitalist interests, admits in a Kiev dispatch, dated April 26, that fraternisation has begun at the front. Numerous communications from soldier delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Petrograd confirm this statement.

Having begun to fraternise, the Russian and German soldiers, the proletarians and peasants of both countries dressed in soldiers' uniforms, have proved to the whole world that intuitively the classes oppressed by the capitalists have discovered the right road to the cessation of the butchery of peoples.

By fraternisation we understand, first, the publication of proclamations in the Russian and the German languages for distribution

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII.—Ed.

at the front; second, the arrangement, with the aid of interpreters, of meetings between the Russian and the German soldiers at the front, this to be done in a way that the capitalists, as well as the generals and officers of both countries who for the most part are of the capitalist class, will not dare to interfere with these meetings, will not dare even to attend them without the direct and special permission of the soldiers.

In such proclamations and at such meetings we must explain the above stated opinions concerning war and peace, we must point out that were the state power in the two countries, Germany and Russia, to pass wholly and exclusively into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the whole of humanity would heave a sigh of relief, for then we would actually be assured of a speedy termination of the war, of a most enduring truly democratic peace among all the peoples, and also of the certain passing of all countries into Socialism.

The Conference declares, that the soldiers must be kept not on money obtained through loans that enrich the capitalists, but on funds derived from an especially high income and property tax imposed on the capitalists.

Written April 28-29, 1917.

VI

TWO REBUTTALS MADE DURING THE DISCUSSION ON THE QUESTION OF MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS, MAY 5, 1917¹³⁶

1

SINCE we have proportional representation, there is no need for a bloc; the minority is protected. I emphatically disagree with Comrade Kalinin, because a bloc with the petty bourgeoisie, with the chauvinists, is unthinkable. The slightest thought of a bloc with the petty bourgeoisie, which is supported by the capitalists, is a betrayal of Socialism. With whom should we form blocs, with the editors of the *International?*¹³⁷ But this paper is not published yet, and therefore we do not know them. Chkheidze is the worst shield for defencism. Trotsky, when he was editing a paper in Paris, never made it clear whether he was for or against Chkheidze. We have always spoken against Chkheidze, because he very subtly covers up chauvinism. Trotsky has never made himself clear. How

do we know that Larin, the editor of the *International*, does not believe in the same tactics?

We must come forward with a definite programme. There is a struggle going on now among three parties: The first is the party of robbers and murderers; the second is the party that shields these robbers with pretty words, and finally, the third party, the party that refuses to support robbers, that stands for exposing the mistakes made by everybody, including the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The fault of the Soviet is not in that it has not seized power, but in that it teaches the people wrong things, it shouts of its victory over the government.

2

I am decidedly in favour of placing on our tickets the names of the Menshevik candidates who are breaking with chauvinism. This is no bloc. As far as parties are concerned, Russia is remarkably well organised. About a programme: The question of a paid militia, the question of supplies, the question of taxes—all these questions are important.

VII

RESOLUTION ON THE MUNICIPAL QUESTION¹³⁸

THE municipal platform can under no circumstances, and particularly at the present revolutionary time, be reduced only to communal questions.

It must also contain a definite answer to all the basic questions concerning the war and concerning the tasks of the proletariat with regard to central power.

And even in municipal problems, such as the question of militia, supplies, housing, taxes, we cannot expect the consent of the bourgeois parties to revolutionary measures that are needed in the struggle against war and its consequences.

For the above reasons it is necessary that we go to the elections without blocs, upon a straight issue of principles announced in the programme of the proletarian party, explaining to the people the fundamental difference of the three main party divisions: 1. The Cadets and those to the Right of them; 2. The parties of the petty bourgeoisie (Narodniks) and the groups of workers who have fallen under the influence of the bourgeoisie (the Menshevik-defencists); 3. The party of the revolutionary proletariat (the Bolsheviks).

The technical provisions of elections, conducted on the principle of proportional representation, make blocs technically superfluous.

With those of the Mensheviks who are breaking with revolutionary defencism and with the support of the Provisional Government, it is by all means advisable to encourage closer relations and mutual understanding on the basis of practical work; with such comrades it is permissible to form common tickets, on condition that there be sufficient agreement on fundamentals. It is necessary to work out concrete suggestions concerning a municipal programme, particularly as regards the question of a proletarian militia to be paid by the capitalists.

ARTICLES, SPEECHES, RESOLUTIONS, ETC., ON THE
EVE OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL [MAY] CONFERENCE
OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

FROM APRIL 29 TO MAY 7, 1917

THE CONGRESS OF PEASANT DEPUTIES

SINCE April 26 there has been meeting in the Tavrichesky Palace a congress of representatives from peasant organisations and from the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies who have come together to work out a plan for the convocation of an All-Russian Soviet of Peasants' Deputies and the organisation of similar local Soviets.¹³⁹

According to the *Dielo Naroda*, representatives from more than twenty provinces are attending this congress.

Resolutions have been adopted stressing the need of organising the "peasantry" from the bottom "to the top" as quickly as possible. "Soviets of Peasants' Deputies of the various active regions" have been declared to be "the best form of peasant organisation."

Bykovsky, a member of the provisional bureau in charge of calling the present congress, has pointed out that it was the Moscow Co-operative Congress, representing twelve million organised members or fifty million people, that decided to organise the peasantry by way of creating an All-Russian Soviet of Peasants' Deputies.

This is a matter of tremendous importance, that should be supported by all means. If it should be carried into life, without delay, if the peasantry, contrary to the advice of Shingarev, should by majority decision and not by a "voluntary agreement" with the landowners, take over all the lands immediately, then not only the soldier would gain by receiving more bread and meat, but so would the cause of freedom.

For the organisation of the peasants themselves only from below, without the interference of bureaucrats, without the "control and supervision" of the landowners and their hangers on, is the best and only assurance of the success of the revolution, the success of freedom, the successful liberation of Russia from the yoke and oppression of the landowners.

There is no doubt that all members of our party and all class-conscious workers will do everything in their power to help organise Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, will strive to increase their numbers, to augment their power, and will bend every effort to work within the Soviets in a manner strictly in accord with a proletarian class policy.

To carry on such work effectively, it is necessary to unite the various proletarian elements (agricultural workers, day labourers, etc.) *within* the general peasant Soviets, or (but sometimes *and*) to organise independent Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies.

Our aim is not to divide forces; on the contrary, in order to strengthen and widen the movement we must arouse that stratum or, more correctly, that class which, in the terminology of the land-owners and capitalists, is *the very lowest*.

To advance the movement we must free it from bourgeois influence, we must rid it of the inevitable weaknesses, vacillations and errors of the petty bourgeoisie.

This work must be carried on through friendly persuasion, without running ahead of events, without hastening to consolidate organisationally what has not yet been perceived, reflected upon, comprehended or experienced by the representatives of the village proletarians and semi-proletarians themselves. But the work must be done, it must be started immediately and everywhere.

The practical demands and slogans or rather the concrete proposals that we must advance to gain the attention of the peasantry, should be determined by the vital questions of the hour.

The first question is that of the land. The village proletarians will favour the complete and immediate transfer of the *entire* land to the people, and the immediate seizure and management of the land by local committees. But land cannot be eaten. Many millions of households that lack horses, implements, seeds, will gain nothing by the mere transfer of land to the "people."

It is necessary to take up immediately the question of, and to take practical steps towards continuing, wherever there is the least possibility, the management of the large estates as large estates, under the Soviets of Agricultural Labourers' Deputies, employing the services of agriculturists and using the best machines, the best seeds, the best methods of agricultural work.

We cannot conceal from the peasants, least of all from the village proletarians and semi-proletarians, that where there is production of commodities for the market and capitalism, small enterprises cannot free humanity from mass poverty, that it is necessary to consider changing over to economic enterprise on a large scale and of a public nature, and to begin working for it now, by teaching the masses, and in turn learning from the masses the practical and feasible methods of bringing about such a change.

Another important and vital question is that of state organisation and administration. It is not enough to preach democracy, it is not enough to proclaim and to decree it, it is not enough to entrust its realisation to "representatives" of the people in representative institutions. One must *build* democracy directly, from the bottom, on the initiative of the masses themselves, with their active participation in the *entire* life of the state, without "supervision" from above, without officialdom.

Abolish the police, the bureaucracy, and the standing army. Create a *militia* consisting of the whole people, women included, generally and universally armed. This is the practical business which should be launched without delay. The more initiative, variety, daring, creativeness are brought into play by the masses, the better. Not only the village proletarians and semi-proletarians but nine-tenths of the entire peasantry will be sure to follow us, if we can expound our proposition clearly, simply, intelligently, supplying examples and parallels from life. Our proposition, then, is:

Do not allow the police to be re-established;

Do not allow the re-establishment of the all-powerful officialdom which is in reality not subject to recall and belongs to the class of landowners and capitalists;

Do not allow the re-establishment of a standing army separated from the people, serving as a perpetual incentive for various attempts to crush liberty and to revive the monarchy.

Teach the people, down to its lowest strata, the art of administration, not through books but through actual practice to be begun immediately and everywhere, through the utilisation of the experience of the masses.

Democracy from below, democracy without an officialdom, without police, without a standing army; discharge of social duty by a *militia* comprising a universally armed people—this will insure the kind of freedom which no Tsars, no pompous generals, and no capitalists will take away.

ON THE RETURN OF THE EMIGRANTS

To-day's papers are publishing a telegram over the signatures of P. B. Axelrod, L. Martov, Riazanov, Lunacharsky and Natanson, which reads:

WE DECLARE THAT IT IS ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE TO RETURN TO RUSSIA VIA ENGLAND.

Another telegram signed by Mandelberg, former member of the second Duma, Professor Reichesberg, Felix Kon, Ustinov, Balabanova, Andronnikov, and others, reads:

WE SEE A WAY OUT IN AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE RUSSIAN AND THE GERMAN GOVERNMENTS . . . FOR THE EXCHANGE OF INTERNED . . . IN RETURN FOR THE LIBERATION OF A CORRESPONDING NUMBER OF GERMAN CIVILIANS INTERNED IN RUSSIA.

Why shouldn't the gentlemen of the *Russkaia Volia* and the *Yedinstvo* brand also these political emigrants as German agents?

Pravda, No. 34, April 29, 1917.

OUR VIEWS

REPLY TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMISSION OF THE SOVIET OF SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

THE papers of April 29 carried the following resolution:

Upon considering the reports of our comrades concerning the spread of subversive propaganda carried on under revolutionary and even Social-Democratic cover, and particularly that engaged in by the so-called Leninists, and believing such propaganda to be no less harmful than any other counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the Right, realising at the same time the impossibility of resorting to repressive measures against the spread of any propaganda while it remains merely propaganda, the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies declares that it is supremely important that measures be taken to counteract such propaganda by our own propaganda and agitation. We must strive to make our organisations strong enough to be able at any moment to meet any counter-revolutionary action, no matter what its source, by effective actions of our own. We express our earnest wish that the Executive Committee will launch a systematic campaign in the press, and especially in the army units, against the subversive propaganda.

If we compare this resolution with the statement quoted from the leading editorial in *Izvestia* (April 30) against the "dishonourable and disgusting baiting," we see at once the political division on the subject which has made itself manifest in practice: The *Russkaia Volia*, as chief baiter, Mr. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* as "using the same methods" were recognised as such by a witness, the *Dielo Naroda*.

A different stand is taken by the Executive Commission of the Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies which openly admits "the impossibility of resorting to repressive measures against the spread of any propaganda while it remains merely propaganda."

That is why we reprint in full the resolution of the Executive Commission and think it worth while to analyse its meaning.

The resolution regards Lenin's propaganda "as no less harmful than any counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the Right."

Let us see now wherein lie the main points of difference between

- (1) the counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the

Right, (2) the propaganda in support of the Provisional Government, and (3) our own propaganda.

The Right desires the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the return to a monarchy.

The Provisional Government has *promised* to act in agreement with the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Our propaganda consists in demanding that the whole power of the state be turned over to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants' and other Deputies and none other, because the Soviets are definitely known to represent an overwhelming majority of the people. With that in view, we want to endeavour (as was clearly stated by Lenin in his theses on the very first day), through "explaining," to bring the majority of the people to a realisation of the necessity of such a transfer of power.

Now then, the Rights are for a monarchical power. The capitalists are for the power of the capitalists (the Provisional Government is a government of the capitalists); they only promise to act in agreement with the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

We, on the other hand, wish to convince the majority of the people that power must reside solely in the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants' and other Deputies.

It is perfectly obvious that even from the point of view of those who advocate an understanding with the Provisional Government our propaganda cannot be regarded as "no less harmful than any counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the Right." For those favouring an understanding are at present themselves relying on the majority of the people! How then can they maintain that our propaganda which urges the majority to seize power is "no less harmful than any counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the Right"?

This is a glaring inconsistency.

The Soviet of Soldiers' Deputies can hardly support this view of its Executive Commission for long.

Let us go a step further.

Wherein do we really differ?

Chiefly on three points:

1. On the question of land. We demand that the peasants, by the decision of the majority of the peasants themselves in each locality, take over the *entire* land immediately, thus increasing the output of bread and meat for the soldiers.

The Provisional Government favours an "agreement" between the peasants and the landowners, *i. e.*, "an agreement" of three hundred peasants with one landowner.

The future will show whether the majority of the people agrees with us or with the Provisional Government on this question.

2. We favour that type of a republic where, from top to bottom, there is no police, no standing army (instead of a standing army, we believe, there should be a general arming of the people), no officialdom enjoying in fact the privileges of irremovability and high bourgeois salaries. We want all public offices to be elective, all officials to be subject to recall at any time, and their pay to be that of proletarians.

The Provisional Government stands for the return of the police of the usual type; it favours a standing army and the usual kind of officialdom.

3. The Provisional Government wants to continue the war started by Nicholas the Bloody. The Provisional Government stands for the confirmation of the secret, predatory treaties *without consulting the will of the people* and even without making them public.

We are against such a war, against the confirmation of the treaties, against their non-publication.

We urge all nations, without exception, to put an end to the war by concluding not a forcible but a truly democratic peace, that would give freedom to all peoples and nationalities. We wish to prove to the people that in order to end the war by a truly non-coercive peace it is necessary that the power of the state be placed completely and exclusively in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

For as long as the capitalists and the landowners (Guchkov, Lvov, Miliukov) are in power, the war will remain actually under the direction of the capitalists, all promises of peace without annexations will remain mere promises, distrust of the working masses of the world toward the capitalists' government will continue; and the war therefore will drag on.

There is the question: Supposing state power in Russia were turned over to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies while Germany failed to effect a revolution such as would rid it of both Wilhelm II and the German Guchkovs and Miliukovs (for if the German Nicholas II were replaced by the German Guchkovs and

Miliukovs, the situation in regard to the war would not change a whit), what would happen then?

Our answer is: Power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies would be the power of the majority of the people, and the majority consists of workers and poor peasants. They are really not interested in annexations, they will renounce them not in words, but in deed; they will actually cease to be watchdogs of capitalists' profits.

Under such circumstances we too would agree to a revolutionary war against the capitalists of any country, because that in truth would be a war against the interests of capital in general, and not a war in the interest of the capitalists of one particular country.

Another question: How can we advance the cause of peace right now, immediately and practically, if it is impossible to end the war by simply sticking the bayonets into the ground?

Our answer is: The war cannot be terminated by the simple expedient of sticking the bayonets into the ground, nor generally by the one-sided withdrawal of any of the warring nations. Outside of the victory of the workers' revolution over the capitalists, there is, and can be, only one practical and direct way of hastening peace,—and that is the fraternisation of the soldiers at the front.

We must aid, immediately, energetically, by all means at our disposal and unconditionally, the fraternisation of the soldiers of both warring groups at the front.

Such fraternisation has already begun. Let us help it along.

These are our views. We are firmly convinced that the majority of the people will not regard them as "no less harmful than any counter-revolutionary propaganda proceeding from the Right."

N. LENIN.

Pravda, No. 35, May 1, 1917.

HOW THEY HAVE ATTACHED THEMSELVES TO THE CAPITALISTS

IN its leading editorial of April 30, the *Finansovaia Gazeta*,¹⁴⁰ organ of the big capitalists and banks, clearly reveals a fact of very great importance, namely, how the Socialists-Revolutionists, Mensheviks, etc., have bound themselves hand and foot by attaching themselves to the capitalists through their notorious "agreement" with the Provisional Government.

Here is the article in full:

THE LEFTS AND THE LOAN

The Liberty Loan issued by the Provisional Government has elicited less enthusiasm from Left wing circles than it has from the majority of the population.

The Left wing press has split into three groups. Lenin's *Pravda* has definitely come out against the Loan; utilising the occasion to express the point of view of the Bolsheviks. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* steadfastly supports the Loan. Finally, the other organs of the Socialist press—such as the *Rabochaiia Gazeta*, *Zemlia i Volia*,¹⁴¹ *Volia Naroda*¹⁴²—have taken a "middle" ground: a position that is neither here nor there; they are not exactly for the Loan, nor are they exactly against it. This is the position also of the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies which once decided to support the Loan in principle, but has now developed a doubt and is wavering. The *Dien*¹⁴³ was right when it recently reproved this central and most powerful group, which includes the Mensheviks and Socialists-Revolutionists, for its uncertain and ambiguous stand.

As if to give further proof of the justice of the reproof, the Soviet of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies yesterday again returned to the once settled question of the Loan and had a lengthy discussion about it. N. S. Chkheidze announced that the government was expected to issue shortly a new statement exhaustively explaining its stand on questions of foreign and domestic policy. Pending that, N. S. Chkheidze proposed that the consideration of the question of supporting the Loan be deferred.

This attitude of the Lefts is perplexing, to say the least. After all, some one has to run the government and carry out the reforms for which suffering Russia has been longing.

One of the two: Either the present government enjoys the confidence of the Lefts even now, for in the past nothing contravening the assumed obligations has been permitted by it; or it does not enjoy such confidence. In the latter case, the Lefts, in depriving the Provisional Government of their support, must take over not only the control over its activities, but also the entire burden of government and the responsibility before the people and before history. If, however, no blame attaches to anything that the Provisional Government has done up to the present moment, then, naturally, the Lefts

have no business to wait for the government's future acts but must lend it their full support. What is quite inadmissible is their ambiguousness, their evasive reticence, their deliberate omissions which, on the one hand, do not remove one grain of responsibility from the shoulders of the Provisional Government which cannot even justify itself before history on account of isolation, on the other hand, they practically rob the government of the support of the large democratic masses and thus put it in a difficult position.

Socialist movements have always been distinguished for their straightforwardness. The Socialist parties have always eschewed a policy of evasion, of philistine pussyfooting, of elastic opportunism. But now, in the question of the Loan, the central groups of Russian Socialism have abandoned their traditional principles and set out upon the path of Octobrist shilly-shallying. Public opinion has a right to demand of them that they make perfectly clear their attitude on the question of the Loan, that they honestly and openly declare their participation or non-participation in it and thus fulfil their moral obligation to the Provisional Government, which means either to bring it the support of the Left groups or else to make known their disagreement with it.

The bankers mean business. They look upon politics in a business-like way: Once you have promised to support the capitalist government (which wages an imperialist war), then come across with the Loan.

Correct! Having bound themselves hand and foot, the Socialists-Revolutionists and the Mensheviks have meekly surrendered to the capitalists. The promise to issue "shortly" "a new statement exhaustively (!!!?) explaining (it has been by now explained more than enough!) its stand on the questions of foreign and domestic policy" is nothing but an empty pledge.

No "statements" containing declarations, assurances, and pronunciamientos will change the essence of the whole thing. And the essence of it is that the capitalist government of Lvov, Guchkov, Miliukov and Co. represents capitalist interests, is bound up with those interests, and cannot (even if it wishes to) get away from imperialistic, grasping annexationist policies.

To gain the support of the Left groups by means of meaningless promises that are not binding, that is to say, to bolster up its imperialistic policy without in fact receding a step from it by gaining the approval of the Lefts; this is what our imperialist government is trying to do, this is what Chkheidze and his friends are unconsciously helping it to accomplish.

"Octobrist shilly-shallying"—what a winged little phrase! This is not only a business-like, but also a correct evaluation of the Socialist-Revolutionist and Menshevik political line by people who really know.

ON PROLETARIAN MILITIA

IN a correspondence from Kanavin, Province of Nizhni Novgorod, dated April 27, our paper published the information that "*almost all the factories have instituted a workers' militia paid by the factory managements.*"¹⁴⁴

The Kanavin district, according to our correspondent, takes in sixteen factories, about thirty thousand workers, excepting railway employés. This means that the organisation of a workers' militia paid by the capitalists has embraced a considerable number of the largest enterprises in that locality.

The organisation of a workers' militia to be paid by the capitalists is a measure of great—it is no exaggeration to say, of enormous and decisive—importance, practically as well as in principle. The revolution cannot be made safe, the success of its victories cannot be assured, its further development is *impossible*, unless this measure become general, unless it be carried through to the very end, all over the country.

The bourgeois and landowning republicans—who turned republican after they had become convinced of the impossibility of ruling over the people *otherwise*—are trying to establish a republic that is as monarchical as possible; something like the French one which Shchedrin called a republic without republicans.

At the present time, when the landowners and capitalists have come to realise the strength of the revolutionary masses, the most important thing for them is to *safeguard* the most essential institutions of the old régime, to safeguard the old instruments of oppression: the police, the bureaucracy, the standing army. This is why they try to reduce the "citizens' militia" to the old type, *i.e.*, to small detachments of armed people, separated from the masses but in the closest possible contact with, and under the command of, the bourgeoisie.

The minimum programme of Social-Democracy demands the replacement of the standing army by a general arming of the masses. But the majority of the official Social-Democrats in Europe, as well as the majority of our own Menshevik leaders, have "forgotten" or put aside the party programme, substituting chauvinism

(“defencism”) for internationalism, reformism for revolutionary tactics.

And yet, it is now, at the present revolutionary moment, that the need of a general arming of the people is particularly urgent. To assert that, while we have a revolutionary army, it is superfluous to arm the proletariat or to claim that the supply of arms is “insufficient,” is mere deception and trickery. The point is to begin to organise a universal militia forthwith, so that every one should learn the use of arms even if the supply is “insufficient” for all, for it is not at all necessary that the people have enough weapons to arm everybody. The people must learn, one and all, how to use arms, they must belong, one and all, to the militia which is to replace the police and the standing army.

To the workers it is essential that there should be no army separated from the people; it is essential that the workers and soldiers merge into one truly national militia.

Unless this is done, the apparatus for oppression remains in full force, ready to serve Guchkov and his friends, the counter-revolutionary generals, to-day, and Radko Dmitriev or some pretender to the throne or builder of a plebiscite monarchy—to-morrow.

The capitalists need a republic now, because they cannot at present “manage” the people otherwise. But they need a “parliamentary” republic, i.e., one where democracy would be limited to democratic *elections*, to the right of sending to parliament individuals who, as Marx aptly remarked, *represent* and *oppress* the people.

The opportunists of contemporary Social-Democracy who have substituted Scheidemann for Marx have memorised the rule that parliamentarism “should be utilised” (which is absolutely correct), but they have forgotten what Marx taught concerning proletarian democracy as distinguished from bourgeois parliamentarism.

The people need a republic in order to educate the masses in the methods of democracy. Not merely representation along democratic lines is needed, but also the building of the entire state administration from the bottom up by the masses themselves, their actual participation in every step of practical life, their active rôle in the administration. To replace the old organs of oppression, the police, the bureaucracy, the standing army, by a general arming of the people, by an actually universal militia,—this is the only way to guarantee the country a maximum of security against the restaura-

tion of a monarchy and to enable it to proceed, firmly, resolutely and with a clear plan, toward Socialism, not by means of "introducing" it from above but by elevating vast masses of proletarians and semi-proletarians to the art of state administration, to the use of the whole power of the state.

Public service through a police elevated above the people and through bureaucrats, the most faithful servants of the bourgeoisie, through a standing army under the command of landowners and capitalists,—this is the ideal of the bourgeois parliamentary republic in its aspiration to perpetuate the rule of capital.

Public service through a really universal people's militia, composed of men and women, a militia capable partly of replacing the bureaucrats,—all this combined with the electiveness and instant recall of all public officers, and with payment for their labour according to proletarian standards, not "master"-like, not in bourgeois fashion,—this is the ideal of the working class.

This ideal has not only become a part of our programme, it has not only won a place in the history of the working class movement in Europe, namely, in the experience of the Paris Commune, it has not only been appreciated, emphasised, explained and recommended by Marx, but it was actually put into practice by the Russian workers in the years 1905 and 1917.

The Soviets of Workers' Deputies, judging by their significance, and by the type of government they create, are institutions of precisely that kind of democracy which sets aside the old organs of oppression, which follows the road of a universal militia.

But how can we make the militia universal when the proletarians and semi-proletarians are herded in the factories, are crushed by unbearable labour for the landowners and the capitalists?

There is only one way: The capitalists must pay for the militia.

The capitalists must pay the workers for those hours and days which the proletarians devote to public service.

This reliable method is being adopted by the working masses themselves. The example of the Nizhni Novgorod workers should be followed throughout Russia.

Comrade-workers, urge upon the peasants and the rest of the people the necessity of creating a universal militia in place of the police and the old bureaucracy! Institute such and only such a militia! Bring it to life through the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, through the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies, through the organs of

local self-government that fall into the hands of the working class. Under no circumstances be content with a bourgeois militia. Attract the women into public service on an equal footing with the men. See to it that the capitalists pay the workers for days devoted to public service and the militia!

Learn the methods of democracy by actual practice, right now, all by yourselves, from the bottom,—rouse the masses to an active, immediate, universal participation in government,—this and only this will assure the full triumph of the revolution and its unswerving, purposeful advance.

Pravda, No. 36, May 3, 1917.

COLLAPSE?

WE have just been informed that the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies received a note which our Provisional Government had communicated to all its Foreign Representatives.¹⁴⁵

This note is apparently that very "statement" that Chkheidze had expected to be published in about three days and which was to contain definite pronouncements against annexations.

But what has happened instead?

The note contains a direct declaration of the Provisional Government to the effect that Russia will fight to the end, that Russia will not repudiate her obligations to the Allies.

This note has had the effect of a bomb explosion.

The majority of the Executive Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, and others, are completely discomfited. The bankruptcy of the entire policy of "agreements" is obvious—and it has come much sooner than we expected.

The imperialist war will not be ended by palavers within the Contact Commission. . . .

Pravda, No. 36, May 3, 1917.

THE NOTE OF THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

THE cards are on the table. We have good reason to be grateful to Messrs. Guchkov and Miliukov for their note appearing in to-day's papers.

The majority of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Narodniks, Mensheviks, all those who have advocated confidence in the Provisional Government, are sufficiently punished. They hoped, expected and believed that the Provisional Government, under the influence of the beneficent "contact" with Chkheidze, Skobelev, and Steklov, would forever repudiate annexations. It turned out somewhat differently. . . .

In its note of April 18, the Provisional Government announces the "striving of all the people (!) to carry on the war *to a decisive victory.*"

"It is self-evident," adds the note, "that the Provisional Government . . . will fully meet our obligations to our Allies."

Short and clear. War to a decisive victory. The alliance with the English and French bankers has been declared sacred. . . .

Who has concluded this alliance with "our" allies, *i. e.*, with the Anglo-French billionaires? The Tsar, Rasputin, the Tsar's gang, of course. To Miliukov and Co., however, the treaty is sacred.

Why?

Some people say: Because Miliukov is insincere, is a trickster, etc.

But this is not the point. The point is that Guchkov, Miliukov, Tereshchenko, Konovalov represent the capitalists. And the capitalists need the seizure of foreign lands. They will get new markets, new places for the export of capital, new profitable jobs for tens of thousands of their sons, etc. The point is that at the present moment the interests of the Russian capitalists are identical with those of the English and the French capitalists. This, and this only, is the reason why the Tsar's treaties with the Anglo-French capitalists are so dear to the hearts of the Provisional Government of the Russian capitalists.

The new note of the Provisional Government will add fuel to the fire. It will arouse yet more the belligerent spirit of Germany. It

will help Wilhelm the Robber further to deceive "his" workers and soldiers and to lure them into a war "to the bitter end."

The new note of the Provisional Government squarely places before us the question: What next?

From the very first moment of our revolution, the English and French capitalists have been persuading us that the Russian Revolution was made for the one and only purpose, to continue the war "to the end." The capitalists are intent on robbing Turkey, Persia, China. If, in order to accomplish this purpose, it be necessary to slaughter another ten millions or so of Russian muzhiks,—why worry? As long as we get a "decisive victory." . . . Now the Provisional Government has frankly adopted the same view.

Fight—because we want the spoils.

Die, tens of thousands of you every day,—because "we" have not yet fought the thing out to a finish, because we have not yet received our share of the loot! . . .

No class-conscious worker, no class-conscious soldier will further support the policy of "confidence" in the Provisional Government. The policy of confidence is bankrupt.

Our Social-Democratic city conference in its resolution¹⁴⁶ stated that each day would prove the correctness of our view. Yet even we did not expect such a rapid progress of events.

The present Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is given the choice: Either to swallow the pill offered by Guchkov and Miliukov, and this would mean that the Soviet has once for all given up its independent political rôle, and that to-morrow Miliukov, "his legs on the desk," would reduce the Soviet to a mere zero; or to reject Miliukov's note, and this would mean that the Soviet had broken with the old policy of confidence, and had entered upon the course suggested by the *Pravda*.

There is, of course, the middle road to be taken, but for how long?

Workers and Soldiers, declare openly: We demand that there be only one power—the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The Provisional Government, the government of a handful of capitalists, must give way to the Soviets.

ONE OF THE BASIC QUESTIONS

REASONINGS OF THE SOCIALISTS WHO HAVE GONE OVER TO THE BOURGEOISIE

MR. PLEKHANOV gives in this respect an excellent example. In his May First letter to "the association of Socialist students" which was published in to-day's *Riech, Dielo Naroda, Yedinstvo*, he writes:¹⁴⁷

... It (the International Socialist Congress of 1889) understood that the social, or more exactly—the Socialist revolution presupposes prolonged educational and organisational work within the working class. This has been forgotten here by people who summon the Russian labouring masses to seize political power, an act which would be logical only if the objective conditions necessary for a social revolution were present. These conditions are not yet present. . . .

And so on, up to the call for "unanimous support" of the Provisional Government.

This argument of Mr. Plekhanov is most typical of a small group of "has-beens," who call themselves Social-Democrats. And just because it is typical it is worth analysing it fully.

First of all, is it logical and is it fair to refer to the first Congress of the Second International, and not to the last one?

The first Congress of the Second International (1889-1914) took place in 1889, the last—in Basle, in 1912. The Basle Manifesto, which was unanimously adopted, speaks precisely, definitely, directly, and clearly (so that even the Plekhanovs cannot garble it) of a *proletarian revolution*, which, moreover, is considered in connection with the very war which subsequently broke out (in 1914).

It is not difficult to understand why those Socialists who have gone over to the bourgeoisie, should "forget" either the entire Basle Manifesto, or this most important part of it.

Secondly, the seizure of political power by "the Russian labouring masses," writes our author, would be logical only "if the objective conditions necessary for the social revolution were present."

This is a hodgepodge, not a thought.

Granting even that the word "social" is a misprint, and that the

word "Socialist" should be read instead,—this is not the only thing that makes the statement a hodgepodge. What classes do the Russian labouring masses consist of? Everybody knows that they consist of workers and peasants. Which of these classes is in the majority? The peasants. Who are the peasants as far as their class position is concerned? Petty proprietors. Question: If the petty proprietors constitute the majority of the population and if the objective conditions requisite for Socialism are lacking, then how can the majority of the population express itself in favour of Socialism? Who can say anything or who says anything about establishing Socialism against the will of the majority?

Mr. Plekhanov got mixed up in the most ludicrous fashion at the very outset.

To find oneself in a ridiculous position is small punishment for one who, like the capitalist press, conjures up an "opponent" of his own creation instead of honestly quoting the opinions of this or that of his actual political opponents.

Furthermore. In whose hands should political power be placed, even from the point of view of such a commonplace bourgeois democrat as is the writer in the *Riech*? In the hands of the majority of the population. Do the "Russian labouring masses," so inaptly referred to by the confused social-chauvinist, constitute the majority of the people? Undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority!

How then is it possible, if one is to remain true to democracy—even in Miliukov's sense of the word—to be opposed to the "seizure of political power" by the "Russian labouring masses"?

The deeper we go, the greater the confusion. Each step in our analysis reveals new abysses of confusion in Mr. Plekhanov's ideas.

The social-chauvinist is against the transfer of power to the majority of the population in Russia!

Mr. Plekhanov is woefully misinformed. He has also confused,—though Marx as far back as 1875 warned against such confusion,—the "labouring masses" with the mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians. We shall explain the difference to the erstwhile Marxist, Mr. Plekhanov.

Can the majority of the Russian peasantry demand and carry out the nationalisation of the land? Certainly it can. Would this be a Socialist revolution? No. That is still a bourgeois revolution, for the nationalisation of the land is a measure that is not incompatible with the existence of capitalism. It is, at the same time, a

blow against private ownership of the most important means of production. Such a blow strengthens the proletarians and semi-proletarians immeasurably more than these were strengthened by the revolutions of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.

Moreover. Can the majority of the Russian peasantry express itself in favour of consolidating all the banks into one, in favour of having in each village one branch of the national state bank?

It can, because the conveniences and advantages resulting from such a measure would be unquestionable. Even the "defencists" might back up such a measure, for it would heighten enormously Russia's capacity for "defence."

Is it economically possible immediately to bring about such a consolidation of all banks into one? It is, no doubt, fully possible.

Would this be a Socialist measure? No, this would not be Socialism as yet.

Again. Can the majority of the Russian peasantry express itself in favour of having the sugar syndicate pass into the hands of the government, to be controlled by the workers and peasants in order that the prices on sugar may be lowered?

It surely can, for that would benefit the entire people.

Is the measure economically possible? It is fully possible, for economically the sugar syndicate has already consolidated and grown into an industrial organism of national scope. Besides, it was already subject to "government" control (*i. e.*, control by government officials, serving the capitalists) even under tsarism.

Would the taking over of the syndicate by the democratic-bourgeois-peasant state be a Socialist measure?

No, that would not be Socialism as yet. Mr. Plekhanov could easily convince himself of that, if he only recalled the universally known Marxian truths.

We ask then: Would such measures as the consolidation of the banks and the turning over of the sugar syndicate into the hands of a democratic peasant government increase or decrease the import, the rôle, the influence of the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements of the population?

They would undoubtedly increase them, for those measures do not grow out of a system of petty production; they were made possible by those "objective conditions" which were not yet present in 1889, but which are already present now.

Such measures would inevitably increase the import, the rôle, the influence upon the population of the workers, particularly the city workers, the vanguard of the proletarians and semi-proletarians of the city and the country.

After these measures have been put into effect, further progress toward Socialism would become fully possible. With the aid of the more advanced and more prepared workers of Western Europe, once they break with their own Plekhanovs, the actual transition of Russia to Socialism will be inevitable, and the success of such transition assured.

This is the line of reasoning to be pursued by every Marxist and Socialist who has not gone over to the camp of "his own" national bourgeoisie.

Pravda, No. 37, May 4, 1917.

WITH IKONS AGAINST CANNONS, WITH PHRASES AGAINST CAPITAL

THE note of the Provisional Government on war to a victorious end has aroused the indignation even of those who had nourished illusory hopes for a possible renunciation of annexations on the part of the government of capitalists. The newspapers that have been giving expression to this petty-bourgeois policy of illusory hopes, are to-day either grumbling in dismay as does the *Rabochaya Gazeta*, or are trying to vent their indignation on individuals.

The *Novaia Zhizn*¹⁴⁸ writes: "There is no place in the government of democratic Russia for a champion of the interests of international capital! We are certain that the Soviet will not fail to take the most energetic measures toward rendering Mr. Miliukov harmless." And the *Dielo Naroda* gives expression to the same middle-class wisdom in the following manner: Miliukov's note, it says, "is trying to reduce to nothing a declaration of the greatest international importance approved by the entire Cabinet."

With ikons against cannons. With phrases against capital. The government's statement renouncing annexations was a piece of the most worthless diplomatic verbiage which could deceive a benighted peasant, which was able to "confuse" the leaders of the petty bourgeois parties, the Social-Democrats and the Socialists-Revolutionists, the writers of the *Novaia Zhizn* and the *Dielo Naroda*, only because they wanted to be deceived . . . * what empty phrases these: "There is no place in the government of democratic Russia for a champion of the interests of international capital! Is it not a shame that educated people should write such piffle?"

The entire Provisional Government is the government of the capitalist class. The main thing is the class, not the individual. To attack Miliukov personally, to demand, directly or indirectly, his dismissal—is silly, for no removal of individuals will change anything, until different classes are put in power.

To maintain that the championing of capital is irreconcilable

* An omission in the text.—*Ed.*

with the “democracy” of Russia, England, France, etc., is to sink to the level of the economic and political wisdom of a Gapon.

It is pardonable for ignorant peasants to exact from the capitalist “promises” to “live righteously” and not capitalistically, to demand that the capitalist cease “championing the interests of capital.” But for the leaders of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies, for the writers of the *Novaia Zhizn* and the *Dielo Naroda* to adopt such methods means to nourish the illusory hopes placed by the people in the capitalists, hopes that are most harmful and ruinous to the cause of freedom, to the cause of the revolution.

Pravda, No. 37, May 4, 1917.

THE LOGIC OF CITIZEN V. CHERNOV

CITIZEN V. CHERNOV writes in the *Dielo Naroda* of April 29:

He (Lenin) did not even think that, from his point of view, England's consent to his journey would have been better at least in this respect, that it would have been due to the pressure of the Russian Revolution, whereas Germany's consent may appear more suspicious as to motives.¹⁴⁹

Conclusion: Lenin is somewhat of a maniac.

Very well. But what about the thirty arrivals who belong to different parties, including the Bund? Are they all maniacs? Did they "not even think"?

Furthermore: How about the telegram of Martov, Natanson (the leader of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party, mark you), Axelrod and others, which says: "We declare that it is absolutely impossible to return to Russia via England"? (See *Rabochiaia Gazeta* of April 28).

Does it mean that both Martov and Natanson are maniacs, that they too "did not even think"?

But they, these witnesses, do not belong to our party; but he, Natanson, is a witness belonging to V. Chernov's party, and they corroborate the fact that it was absolutely impossible to make the journey in any other way!

The upshot? One or the other: Either V. Chernov is a queer fellow using phrases to avoid facts, or he has allowed himself to be frightened by middle-class-chauvinist slander and calumny to such an extent that he has lost his head.

Pravda, No. 37, May 4, 1917.

MR. PLEKHANOV'S UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPTS AT EXTRICATING HIMSELF

IN No. 15 of the *Yedinstvo*, Mr. Plekhanov, with an abundance of abuse unusual even for that mud-slinging publication, attacks the *Pravda*, in an attempt to hide two incontestably established facts.

You shall not succeed in hiding them, Gentlemen!

Fact number one. Mr. Plekhanov has failed to reprint both our report published in No. 32 of the *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies of April 18, 1917, and the decision of the Executive Committee.

This is not only an expression of Anarchist disrespect for the chosen representatives of the majority of soldiers, but it is the dishonest method of a pogrom-maker.

Fact number two. Mr. Plekhanov's baiting has called forth a protest not from us but from the *Dielo Naroda* in which Kerensky, the colleague of Guchkov and Miliukov, takes part. The *Dielo Naroda* of April 26, 1917, wrote of Mr. Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* black on white:

"... Such words and such methods of struggle we have been accustomed to see on the pages of the *Russkaia Volia*. To see them employed in articles written by Socialists is, frankly speaking, painful and depressing."

This is the testimony of defencist witnesses—who politically are a thousand times nearer to Mr. Plekhanov than to us.

What sort of readers does Mr. Plekhanov count on when he dismisses the testimony of a witness by saying that the *Dielo Naroda* has made an "inept remark"?

The witness has exposed Mr. Plekhanov's pogrom-methods.

There was a time when Mr. Plekhanov was a Socialist, now he has stooped to the level of the *Russkaia Volia*.

No abuse will destroy the fact that even the *Dielo Naroda* has exposed Mr. Plekhanov.

In a leading editorial reprinted in our paper on May 1, the *Izvestia* of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies

(No. 43, April 30) branded this baiting as "dishonest and disgusting."

This witness states openly that such dishonest and disgusting baiting by the dark forces and their newspapers was and is a fact. Mr. Plekhanov, fallen to the level of the *Russkaia Volia*, thus stands hopelessly condemned.

Pravda, No. 37, May 4, 1917.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

MAY 4, 1917¹⁵⁰

HAVING considered the situation developed in Petrograd since the issuance of the imperialist predatory note of the Provisional Government of May 2, 1917, and taking cognisance of a series of popular demonstrations through meetings and parades on the streets of Petrograd on May 3, the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party decides on the following:

1. Party agitators and speakers must refute the despicable lies of the capitalist papers and of the papers supporting the capitalists to the effect that we threaten with *civil war*. This is a despicable lie, for at the present moment, when the capitalists and their government cannot and dare not use violence against the masses, when the mass of soldiers and workers freely expresses its will, freely elects and replaces all public officers,—at such a moment any thought of civil war is naïve, senseless, monstrous; at such a moment there must be full compliance with the will of the majority of the population and free criticism of this will by the dissatisfied minority; should violence be resorted to, the responsibility will fall on the Provisional Government and its supporters.

2. The government of the capitalists and its newspapers, by their noisy denunciation of the alleged civil war, are only trying to conceal the reluctance of the capitalists, who admittedly constitute an insignificant minority of the people, to submit to the will of the majority.

3. In order to learn the will of the majority of the population in Petrograd, where there is now gathered an unusually large number of soldiers familiar with the sentiment of the peasants and correctly expressing it, it is necessary immediately to arrange for a popular vote to be taken in all the boroughs and suburbs of Petrograd on the attitude towards the government's note, on the support of one or the other party, on the desirability of this or another Provisional Government.

4. All party agitators, in factories, in regiments, in the streets,

etc., must advocate these views and this proposition by means of peaceful discussions and peaceful demonstrations, as well as meetings everywhere; we must endeavour to organise regular voting in the factories and the regiments, taking great care to preserve strict order and comradely discipline.

5. The party agitators must protest over and over again against the contemptible slander manufactured by the capitalists to the effect that our party stands for a separate peace with Germany; in our eyes Wilhelm II is a crowned murderer deserving execution no less than Nicholas II, and the German Guchkovs, *i. e.*, the German capitalists, are usurpers, robbers and imperialists no less than the Russian, English and all other capitalists; we are against negotiating with the capitalists, we are for negotiating and fraternising *with the revolutionary workers and soldiers of all the countries*; we are convinced that the government of Guchkov-Miliukov is trying to aggravate the situation because it knows full well that the proletarian revolution in Germany is beginning, and that that revolution will be a blow to the capitalists of all countries.

6. The Provisional Government, when it disseminates rumours concerning complete and unavoidable economic ruin, is not only trying to frighten the people so that it may leave the power in the hands of this Provisional Government but is vaguely, indefinitely, fumblingly expressing that profound and indubitable truth that all the peoples of the world have been led into a blind alley, have been brought by the war for capitalist interests to the edge of an abyss and that there is actually no escape, except through the transfer of power to a revolutionary class, *i. e.*, to the revolutionary proletariat that is capable of revolutionary action.

If there are reserves of bread, etc., in the country, the new government of workers and soldiers will know very well how to take care of them. And if the capitalist war has brought economic ruin to a point where there is no bread at all, then the government of the capitalists will only aggravate the situation instead of improving it.

7. We regard the policies of the majority of the present leaders in the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies who are members of the Narodnik and Menshevik parties, to be deeply erroneous, for faith in the Provisional Government, attempts at reconciliation with it, dickering with it over amendments, would in point of fact mean a multiplication of empty notes, of futile delays; and, moreover, this policy threatens to bring about a situation where the will of

the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies parts ways with the will of the majority of revolutionary soldiers at the front and in Petrograd and of the majority of workers.

8. We call upon those workers and soldiers, who recognise that the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies must change its policy and must give up its policy of confidence in and agreement with the government of the capitalists, to hold new elections of delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and to send there only such delegates as would steadfastly carry out a definite idea in conformity with the actual will of the majority.

Pravda, No. 38, May 5, 1917.

HONEST DEFENCISM REVEALS ITSELF

EVENTS in Petrograd during the last few days, especially yesterday, prove how right we were when we pointed out the difference between the "honest" defencism of the masses and the defencism of the leaders and parties.

The mass of the population is composed of proletarians, semi-proletarians, and poor peasants. This is the overwhelming majority of the people. These classes are certainly not interested in annexations; in an imperialist policy, in the profits of bank capital, in incomes from railroads in Persia, in fat jobs in Galicia and Armenia, in repressing the freedom of Finland,—in all these things they (these classes) are not interested.

But all this, taken together, is precisely what science and journalism are agreed on calling imperialist, annexationist policy.

The crux of the matter is this. The Guchkovs, the Miliukovs, and the Lvovs, even if they all were paragons of virtue, disinterestedness, and love of their fellow-men, are, after all, the chosen representatives and leaders of the capitalist class, a class interested in a predatory annexationist policy. This class has invested billions "in the war." It is making hundreds of millions "out of the war" and annexations (*i. e.*, out of forced subjugation, or incorporation of alien nationalities).

To hope that the capitalist class would "mend its ways," would cease being a capitalist class, would give up its profits, is a fatuous hope, an empty dream, and in practice a deception of the people. Only petty-bourgeois politicians, fluctuating between capitalist and proletarian policies, could cherish and support such fatuous hopes. This precisely is the error of the present leaders of the Narodnik parties and the Mensheviks, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Chernov, etc.

The mass representatives of defencism are not at all familiar with politics. They have had no opportunity to learn politics either from books, or from participation in the Duma, or from carefully observing people engaged in politics.

The mass representatives of defencism are still ignorant of the fact that wars are conducted by *governments*, that governments

represent the interests of certain *classes*, that the present war is waged, on the part of either group of belligerent powers, by capitalists for predatory interests and capitalist aims.

Ignorant of all this, the mass representatives of defencism reason quite simply: We do not want annexations, they say, we demand a democratic peace, we do not want to fight for Constantinople, for the stifling of Persia, for the robbing of Turkey, etc.; we "demand" that the Provisional Government give up its policy of annexations.

The mass representatives of defencism sincerely wish all this, not in a personal but in a class sense, because they speak for classes not interested in annexations. But these representatives of the masses do not know that the capitalists and their government may reject the policy of annexations in words, may "get off" with promises and pretty phrases, without actually abandoning annexationist ideas.

That is why the mass representatives of defencism were so violently and justly indignant over the Provisional Government's note of May 1.

People acquainted with politics could not have been startled by this note, for they knew quite well that when the capitalists "renounce annexations" they do not really mean it. It is no more than the usual trick and a diplomatic phrase.

But the honest, the mass representatives of defencism were amazed, indignant, furious. They felt—they did not understand it quite clearly, but they felt—that they had been tricked.

This is the essence of the crisis and it should be clearly distinguished from the opinions, expectations, and suppositions of single individuals and parties.

To "stuff up" the yawning gap for a short time with a new declaration, a new note (this is what Mr. Plekhanov's advice in the *Yedinstvo* and the aspirations of the Miliukovs and Company on the one hand, Chkhheidze and Tsereteli on the other, reduce themselves to)—to "stuff up" the crack with a piece of paper is of course possible; nothing but harm, however, is likely to result. A new piece of paper would inevitably mean a new deception, therefore a new outburst of indignation. Should this outburst lack in intelligent orientation, it might easily become harmful.

The masses should be told the truth. The government of the capitalists *cannot* reject annexations; it is caught in the meshes, it has no escape. It senses, it realises, it sees that without revo-

lutionary measures (of which only a revolutionary class is capable) there is no salvation; and it shifts about, it is frantic, it promises one thing, does another, now it threatens the masses with violence (Guchkov and Shingarev), now it proposes that power be taken away from it.

Economic ruin, crisis, horrors of war, an impasse from which there is no escape—this is what all the peoples have come to under capitalist leadership.

There is indeed no escape—*except* through the transfer of power to the revolutionary class, to the revolutionary proletariat, which alone, supported by the majority of the population, is capable of aiding the revolution to victory in *all* the warring countries and leading humanity to permanent peace and liberation from the yoke of capitalism.

Pravda, No. 38, May 5, 1917.

INSANE CAPITALISTS OR FEEBLE-MINDED SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

THE *Rabochaia Gazeta* writes to-day:

We have firmly opposed the fanning of civil war by Lenin's followers. But the signal for civil war is now given not by Lenin's followers but by the Provisional Government when it publishes a statement that makes mockery of democratic aspirations. This indeed is an insane step, and immediate and determined action by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is needed if we would avert the dire consequences of this madness.¹⁵¹

Is there anything more absurd and ridiculous than this fairy-tale about our "fanning civil war," when we have declared in the clearest, most formal and unequivocal language that the main burden of our work is the patient explaining of proletarian policy as opposed to the petty-bourgeois, defencist obsession of faith in the capitalists?

Does the *Rabochaia Gazeta* really fail to understand that this howl about civil war is now raised by the capitalists in order to break the will of the majority of the people?

Is there a grain of Marxism in branding the present conduct of the capitalists as "madness," when, caught in the vise of Russian and Anglo-French imperialistic capital, they cannot act otherwise?

In to-day's *Yedinstvo*, Mr. Plekhanov voices even more openly the policy of the entire petty-bourgeois-defencist bloc when he calls upon the Soviet to come "to an agreement" with the Provisional Government. An amusing call. It is like serving mustard after dinner.

But an agreement has been in existence for quite some time! It has existed ever since the beginning of the revolution! And the whole question of the present crisis is just this, that the agreement proved to be a scrap of paper, an empty promise! To answer the "accursed questions" now confronting the people in consequence of the failure of a given agreement by calling for an "agreement" in general, without stating its conditions or demanding real guarantees, to answer by sighing and crying "O ye Madmen!"—is this not a tragic-comedy of our petty-bourgeois Louis Blancs? (Louis Blanc

was a labour leader only in words, in reality he was trailing behind the bourgeoisie.)

"Immediate and determined action . . . is needed," importantly declares the *Rabochaia Gazeta*. What kind of "action," my dear fellow-citizens? You yourselves cannot tell this, you yourselves do not know, for all you do is declaim, because you, just like Louis Blanc, have really forgotten the class struggle, and, instead of the class struggle, have taken to petty-bourgeois phraseology and declamation.

Pravda, No. 38, May 5, 1917.

ADVICE OR ORDER OF SHINGAREV, AND ADVICE OF ONE LOCAL SOVIET OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES

THE Petrograd *Gazeta-Kopeika*¹⁵² for April 27 publishes the following communication:

REQUISITION OF PRIVATELY OWNED LANDS

Kishenev, April 26.

In view of the fact that there is in that district a vast tract of unused land, not leased because of high rent, the Akkerman Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies suggested to all village and volost committees, in case no voluntary agreements are possible, to requisition through the Commissar all unused privately-owned lands for planting.

If this communication is true, it is exceedingly important. Obviously, the Akkerman Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is actuated by practical considerations; it no doubt knows local conditions thoroughly and intimately. It calculates correctly that the area of cultivation must be increased at all costs, and to the highest limits. But how can it be done when the landowners have raised the rents to monstrous dimensions?

Voluntary agreements with landowners?

Minister Shingarev definitely advises this procedure from Petrograd; he threatens the peasants, he vociferates against arbitrary measures. It is easy for Shingarev to argue from Petrograd. It is easy for him to defend the landowners in the name of the government of the capitalists.

But how about the situation of the peasants locally? Does the Akkerman Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies not appraise the situation much more correctly when it speaks of "voluntary agreements" as not being "possible"?

Pravda, No. 38, May 5, 1917.

RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

ADOPTED IN THE MORNING OF MAY 5, 1917

THE political crisis that developed May 2-4, should be considered, at least in its first stage, as having come to an end.

The petty-bourgeois masses, angered by the capitalists, first drew away from them toward the workers; but a day later they again turned to the Menshevik and Narodnik leaders who are advocating "confidence" in and "agreement" with the capitalists.

The above-mentioned leaders have accepted a compromise, completely surrendering all their positions, and satisfying themselves with utterly futile, purely verbal capitalist promises.

The causes of the crisis have not been removed, and the recurrence of similar crises is inevitable.

The root of the crisis is this, that the petty-bourgeois mass is vacillating between the age-old faith in the capitalists and bitterness against them, which means a desire to entrust themselves to the revolutionary proletariat.

The capitalists are prolonging the war, drawing a veil of phrases over it. Only the revolutionary proletariat can and does bring about a termination of the war through a world-wide workers' revolution which is clearly discernible here, which is ripening in Germany, and which is drawing near in many other countries.

Therefore, the slogan, "Down with the Provisional Government," is at the present moment not sound, because such a slogan, unless there is a solid (*i.e.*, a class-conscious and organised) majority of the people on the side of the revolutionary proletariat, is either a mere phrase, or, objectively, reduces itself to encouraging efforts of an adventurous nature.

We shall come out in favour of the transfer of power into the hands of the proletarians and semi-proletarians, only when the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies adopt our policy and are willing to take that power into their own hands.

The organisation of our party, the consolidation of proletarian forces, have clearly proved inadequate in the days of crisis.

The slogans of the moment are: (1) Elucidation of the proletarian policy and the proletarian method of terminating the war; (2) criticism of the petty-bourgeois policy of confidence in and agreement with the capitalist government; (3) propaganda and agitation from group to group, within each regiment, in each factory, particularly amongst the most backward masses, servants, unskilled labourers, etc., for it is mostly on them that the bourgeoisie tried to base itself during the days of the crisis; (4) organisation, organisation and once more organisation of the proletariat: in each factory, in each district, in each block.

The order issued by the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on May 4, prohibiting all street meetings and demonstrations for two days, must be unconditionally obeyed by every member of our party. The Central Committee has since yesterday morning been distributing the printed resolution, published in to-day's *Pravda*, which stated that "at such a moment any thought of civil war is senseless and monstrous," that demonstrations, when they do occur, must be peaceful, and that all responsibility for violence rests upon the Provisional Government and its supporters.* That is why our party regards the entire above mentioned order of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies (and particularly the one prohibiting armed demonstrations and shooting into the air) to be wholly sound and deserving of unconditional obedience.

We call upon all the workers and soldiers to weigh carefully the entire crisis of the last two days and to send as delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and to the Executive Committee only those comrades who express the will of the majority. In all cases where a delegate does not express the opinion of the majority, it is necessary to hold new elections in the factories and the barracks.

Pravda, No. 39, May 6, 1917.

* See p. 245 of this book.—*Ed.*

LESSONS OF THE CRISIS

PETROGRAD and the whole of Russia have gone through a serious political crisis, the first political crisis since the revolution.

On May 1 the Provisional Government issued its notorious note, which confirmed the predatory aims of the war with such clarity that it was sufficient to arouse the indignation of the masses who had honestly believed in the desire (and ability) of the capitalists to "renounce the policy of annexations." On May 3 and 4 Petrograd was astir. The streets were crowded with people; meetings of various sizes were held everywhere, day and night; mass manifestations and demonstrations were going on uninterruptedly. Yesterday, May 4, the crisis or, at any rate, the first stage of the crisis came to an end: the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and later the Soviet itself, declared that they were satisfied with the "explanations," amendments to the note and "elucidations" of the government (empty phrases that say absolutely nothing, change nothing, and commit one to nothing), and "the incident was closed."

The future will show whether the masses will regard the "incident as closed." The task before us now is carefully to examine the forces, the classes that revealed themselves in the crisis, and to draw therefrom lessons for the party of the proletariat. For it is the great significance of all crises that they unveil the hidden, cast aside the conventional, the superficial, the petty, sweep away the political rubbish, uncover the secret springs of the true class-struggle that is going on.

As a matter of fact the capitalist government on May 1 merely reiterated its former declarations, which enveloped the imperialist war in a mist of equivocation. The soldier masses grew indignant, because they had honestly believed in the sincerity and pacific intentions of the capitalists. The demonstrations started as soldiers' demonstrations under a contradictory, unintelligent, leading-nowhere slogan, "Down with Miliukov" (as if a change in the personnel or cliques could change the essence of their policy).

That means that the broad, unstable, vacillating mass, which is

closest to the peasantry and petty-bourgeoisie by scientific class definition, drew away from the capitalists *toward the side* of the revolutionary workers. It was this fluctuation or movement of the mass, whose strength was capable of settling everything, that created the crisis.

Immediately a commotion started, people poured into the streets, and began to organise; but those were not the middle, but the extreme elements; not the in-between petty-bourgeois mass, but the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

The bourgeoisie occupies the Nevsky—in the expression of one paper, the “Miliukovsky”—Prospect and the adjacent sections of prosperous, bureaucratic, and capitalistic Petrograd. Officers, students, “the middle classes” parade *for* the Provisional Government. Among the slogans on the banners one often sees the inscription, “Down with Lenin.”

The proletariat rises in *its own* quarters, in the workers’ suburbs, it organises around the slogans and watchwords of the Central Committee of our party. On May 3 and 4, the Central Committee adopts resolutions which through the organisational apparatus are directly passed on to the proletarian masses. The workers’ processions fill the poorer and less central sections of the city, and later in separate groups they enter the Nevsky. The proletarian demonstrations are distinguished from the bourgeois ones by greater animation and mass character. Among the inscriptions on the banners—“All Power to the Soviet of Workers’ and Soldiers’ Deputies.”

It comes to a collision on the Nevsky. Banners of “enemy” processions are torn. The Executive Committee receives telephone messages from various points that there is shooting on both sides, that there are killed and wounded; information, however, is exceedingly contradictory and unreliable.

Fearing that the real masses, the actual majority of the people might seize power, the bourgeoisie expresses this fear by shouting about the “spectre of civil war.” The petty-bourgeois leaders of the Soviet, the Mensheviks and Narodniks, lacking a definite party programme in the period after the revolution, and particularly in the days of the crisis, allow themselves to be intimidated. In the Executive Committee, which on the eve of the crisis was almost evenly divided between those who were for the Provisional Government and those against it, thirty-four ballots are cast (against nine-

teen) *for* a return to the policy of confidence in the capitalists and agreement with them.

The "incident" is declared "closed."

What is the essence of the class struggle? The capitalists are for continuing the war, and for concealing their aims behind a smoke-screen of phrases and promises. They have become entangled in the nets of Russian, Anglo-French and American bank capital. The proletariat, through its class-conscious vanguard, stands for taking over of power by the revolutionary class, the working class and semi-proletarians, it stands for the development of a world-wide proletarian revolution which is clearly rising in Germany, it stands for the termination of the war through such a revolution.

The broad mass, of a predominantly petty-bourgeois nature, still trusting its Narodnik and Menshevik leaders, intimidated by the bourgeoisie and actually carrying out the policy of the bourgeoisie, under various pretexts, is swinging now to the right, now to the left.

War is terrible; it is the masses that feel it most keenly; it is among the masses that the realisation, as yet not very clear, is growing that this war is criminal, that it is waged because of the rivalry and the scrambling among capitalists for the division of spoils. The international situation is becoming ever more entangled. There is no escape, except through an international proletarian revolution, which is now sweeping Russia, and which is already developing (strikes, fraternisation) in Germany. The masses fluctuate from faith in the old masters, the capitalists, to bitterness against them; from faith in the new class, the only consistently revolutionary class that is breaking a new path leading to a brighter life for the toilers,—the proletariat,—to a vague understanding of its world-wide historical rôle.

This is not the first *and not the last* instance of indecision of the petty-bourgeois and the semi-proletarian masses!

The lesson is clear, comrade-workers! Time does not wait. After the first crisis, others will follow. Consecrate *all* your strength to the cause of enlightening those who are lagging behind, creating direct comradely contact (not merely through meetings) with each regiment, with each group of toilers who are still in the dark! Devote *all* your strength to uniting your own forces, organising the workers from the ground up, taking in every borough, every factory, every block in the city and its suburbs! Do not be misled by petty-

bourgeois "peace makers" who "reconcile" themselves to the capitalists, by the defencist "supporters" of the Government's policies nor by individuals inclined to be hasty and to shout, "Down with the Provisional Government!" before the majority of the people are strongly united. Crises cannot be overcome by the violence of individuals against other individuals, by partial risings of small groups of armed people, by Blanquist attempts to "seize power," to "arrest" the Provisional Government, etc.

The slogan of the day is: Explain more carefully, more clearly, more broadly the proletarian policy, the proletarian method of terminating the war. Fall in line everywhere, strongly, numerously, fill the proletarian ranks and columns! Rally around your Soviets; use comradely suasion and re-election of individual members inside the Soviets to consolidate a majority around yourselves.

Pravda, No. 39, May 6, 1917.

HOW A SIMPLE QUESTION IS MUDDLED

TO-DAY the *Dien* writes the following concerning the resolution adopted by the Central Committee on May 5 on the necessity of transferring power to the revolutionary proletariat "*with the support of the majority of the people*":

"Very simple, but in that case why hesitate? Instead of passing resolutions, why not come and take power?"

Here is a typical example of the usual methods of the bourgeois press! People pretend not to understand the simplest thing, and easily prove themselves to be in the right—on paper. Whoever advises to "take power," should, upon reflection, realise that, without the support of the majority of the people, the attempt to take power would be a questionable venture, a Blanquist act (the *Pravda* has taken special pains to warn against this,—it did it conscientiously, clearly, precisely, unequivocally).

In Russia we have now a degree of freedom that enables us to ascertain the will of the majority by the composition of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Therefore, the proletarian party, if it seriously wishes to gain power (not Blanquist fashion), must *fight for influence* within the Soviets.

All this has been told, retold and explained over again by the *Pravda*, and only stupidity or malice can fail to grasp it. Let the reader judge for himself to which of the two contemptible categories the *Rabochiaia Gazeta* belongs, when it brands the suggestion (made to the Soviet) "to take power into its own hands" as "irresponsible provocation," "demagogic, devoid of all sense of political responsibility, wantonly calling democracy to civil strife and war, inciting the workers and soldiers not only against the government but also against the Soviet itself. . . ."

Can one imagine a worse muddle than this? Can demagogic go any further in putting the blame where it does not belong?

Prime Minister Lvov, according to the report of the evening paper *Birzhevya Viedomosti*¹⁵³ of May 4, literally said the following:

In the past the Provisional Government has met with the invariable support of the leading organ of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

During the last two weeks these relations have changed. The Provisional Government is under suspicion. Under such circumstances the government is absolutely unable to govern the state, since in an atmosphere of distrust and disaffection it is difficult to do anything. Under such circumstances it is best for the Provisional Government to resign. It fully realises its responsibility to the Fatherland and for the sake of the country's welfare it is ready to resign forthwith, if this be necessary.

Is this not clear? Is it possible not to understand why, after such a speech, our Central Committee suggested that the people be asked to express itself on the subject?

What have "civil war," "provocation," "demagogic" and similar terrible words to do with the question, when the Prime Minister himself announces the government's readiness "to resign"??? When he himself has recognised the Soviets as the "leading organ"???

One or the other: Either the *Rabochaia Gazeta* assumes that Lvov, in making such or similar declarations is deceiving the people,—then, instead of calling for confidence in and support of the government, it should urge *a denial of confidence and a refusal of support*; or the *Rabochaia Gazeta* assumes that Lvov is indeed "ready to resign"—then why all this howl about civil war?

If the *Rabochaia Gazeta* has a true understanding of the situation, and realises that the *capitalists*, by raising the bugaboo of civil war, are covering up *their* desire to undo through the use of violence the will of the majority, then why does it make all this noise?

Lvov has a right to suggest to the Soviet that it approve and accept his policy. Our party, on the other hand, has a right to suggest to the Soviet that it approve and accept our proletarian policy. To speak of "provocation" etc., is to reveal a dire lack of understanding of the whole matter or to stoop to the basest demagogic. We have a right to fight for, and are going to fight for influence and a majority in the Soviet and the Soviets. And we repeat:

"We shall come out in favour of the transfer of power into the hands of the proletarians and semi-proletarians only when the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies adopt our policy and are willing to take that power into their own hands."

“DISGRACE” AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE CAPITALISTS AND THE PROLETARIANS

To-day *Yedinstvo* prints on the first page in bold face type a proclamation signed by Plekhanov, Deutsch, and Zasulich. The proclamation reads in part:

... Every people has a right freely to determine its own destiny. Wilhelm the German and Karl the Austrian will never agree to that. In waging war against them, we are defending our own freedom, as well as the freedom of others. Russia cannot betray her Allies. That would bring disgrace upon her. . . .¹⁶⁴

Thus reason all the capitalists. They regard it as a disgrace not to live up to treaties entered into by capitalists, just as monarchs regard it as a disgrace not to live up to treaties concluded by monarchs.

And what about the workers? Do they regard it a disgrace not to live up to treaties concluded by monarchs and capitalists?

Of course not! Class-conscious workers stand for the abrogation of all such treaties, for the recognition of only such agreements entered into by the workers and soldiers of all the countries, as would benefit the people, i. e., not the capitalists, but the workers and poorest peasants.

The workers of the world have a treaty of their own, namely, the Basle Manifesto of 1912 (signed also by Plekhanov and betrayed by him). This workers’ “treaty” regards it as a “crime” when workers of different countries fire at each other for the sake of capitalists’ profits.

The writers in the *Yedinstvo* reason like capitalists (the *Riech* and the others reason similarly), and not like workers.

It is perfectly true that neither the German monarch nor the Austrian monarch will agree to the freedom of any people, for both these monarchs are crowned murderers, just as was Nicholas II. But, first of all, the English, the Italian, and the other monarchs (“Allies” of Nicholas II) are not a whit better. To forget it is to become a monarchist or a defender of the monarchists.

And secondly, the uncrowned murderers, *i. e.*, the capitalists, have shown themselves in the present war to be in no way better than the Monarchs. Has not American "democracy," *i. e.*, the democratic capitalists, robbed the Philippines, and does it not rob Mexico?

The German Guchkovs and Miliukovs, were they to replace Wilhelm II, would also be murderers, in no way better than the English and the Russian capitalists.

Thirdly, will the Russian capitalists "agree" to the "freedom" of peoples which they themselves oppress: Armenia, Khiva, Ukraine, Finland?

By evading this question the writers in the *Yedinstvo* are actually turning into defenders of "our" capitalists and their predatory war upon other capitalists.

The internationalist workers of the world stand for the overthrow of *all* capitalist governments, for a refusal to come to agreements and sign treaties with any capitalists, for *universal peace* concluded by the revolutionary workers of all the countries, a peace actually capable of securing the freedom of *every* people.

Pravda, No. 39, May 6, 1917.

INTERVIEW WITH E. TORNIAINEN, MAY 6, 1917¹⁵⁵

WE think that the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies at the present moment represents the majority of the workers and soldiers. In so far as we (Bolsheviks) are concerned, we are contending for influence and a majority in the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies as well as in all the local Soviets. We propose that the workers and soldiers hold new elections of members of the Soviets in cases where the delegates are not fully responsive to the will of the majority.

So far the majority of the Soviets follows the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders.

We have no doubt that the Soviet will be able to retain power should it be supported by a considerable and strong majority of workers and soldiers. The more so since that power, instead of protracting the war, would bring about its speedy termination on terms most favourable to the masses of the people. We also think that the Soviet, being an institution elected by the workers and soldiers, can no doubt draw to its side an overwhelming majority of workers and soldiers.

Whether or not the capitalist government will be able to refuse to convoke the Constituent Assembly, will depend upon the development and the strength of the counter-revolution. The elements of such a counter-revolution are no doubt already in existence.

The termination of the war by a truly democratic peace depends upon the course of the revolution of the world proletariat. This revolution already occupies a favourable position in Russia, and it surely is developing in Germany (mass strikes, fraternisation).

Työmies, May 8, 1917.

FOOLISH MALICIOUS GLEE

THE *Rabochaia Gazeta* is jubilant; it fairly jumps with malicious glee over the latest resolution of the Central Committee which (in connection, be it noted, with a declaration of the representatives of the Bolshevik fraction of the Soviets already published) has revealed certain disagreements within our party.¹⁵⁶

Let the Mensheviks be jubilant and jump with malicious glee. It does not perturb us in the least. After all, the Mensheviks have no organisation whatever, Chkheidze and Tsereteli are one thing, they are Ministers without portfolios; the Organisation Committee is another thing, they are Social-Democrats without a policy; the "defencists" are a third thing, they are for Plekhanov. Martov is a fourth thing, he is opposed to the Loan. Is there any wonder that people who have neither an organisation nor a party, lightheartedly jump and rejoice when they discover a defect in somebody else's organisation?

We have no reason to fear the truth. Yes, comrade-workers, the crisis has revealed certain flaws in our organisation. Let us work, then, to correct them!

The crisis revealed a very feeble attempt to move in a direction "slightly more to the Left" than the Central Committee.¹⁵⁷ Our Central Committee did not yield, and we do not doubt for a moment that harmony within our party is already being restored, a harmony that is voluntary, intelligent, and complete.

Every day proves the soundness of our policy. For a successful carrying out of this policy we need an organisation of the proletarian masses three times as good as the present one. Each district, each block, each factory, each military company must have a powerful, closely-knit organisation capable of acting as one man. Ties must connect each such organisation directly with the centre, with the Central Committee; those ties must be strong, so that the enemy may not break them with the first blow; those ties must be permanent, must be strengthened and tested every day and every hour, so that the enemy does not catch us unawares.

Comrade-workers! Let us build from the bottom up, everywhere,

a powerful proletarian mass organisation both among the working masses and in the army; let us start immediately. Let us not be perturbed by the malice of our enemies, let us not fear occasional errors and defects. We shall correct them. The future is ours.

Pravda, No. 40, May 8, 1917.

DRAFT OF THESES FOR A RESOLUTION ON THE SOVIETS¹⁵⁸

IN many local centres, particularly workers' centres, the rôle played by the Soviets has proved particularly important. They have become the sole ruling power; the bourgeoisie has been completely disarmed and reduced to unqualified submission; wages have been increased, the working day has been shortened, while production has not been decreased; supplies have been made secure, control over production and distribution has been established; all the old organs of power have been removed; revolutionary initiative of the peasants in the matter of government (removal of old and establishment of new organs of power) as well as in the matter of land is encouraged.

In the capital and in a few large centres the reverse may be observed: the composition of the Soviets is less proletarian; in the Executive Committees the influence of the petty-bourgeois element is considerably greater, also—and particularly—in the commissions there prevails the policy of "co-operation with the bourgeoisie," which interferes with the revolutionary initiative of the masses, bureaucratises the revolutionary movement of the masses and their revolutionary tasks, hampers every revolutionary measure that is likely to "affect" the capitalists.

It is quite natural and inevitable that after the greatest development of revolutionary energy in the capital, where the people and particularly the workers made the greatest sacrifices in order to overthrow tsarism, where the central state power was overthrown and the most centralised forces of capital gave a maximum of power to the capitalists, the power of the Soviets (and the power of the proletariat) should have proved inadequate, the task of further developing the revolution particularly difficult, transition to the next higher phase of the revolution especially hard, and resistance of the bourgeoisie stronger than anywhere else.

It follows that while in the capital and the largest centres all efforts should be directed mainly toward preparing the forces for

the *completion* of the second stage of the revolution, locally we can and must directly move the revolution onward, by concentrating all power in the hands of the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, by developing the revolutionary energy of the worker and peasant masses, by establishing control over the production and distribution of products, etc.

The following course of the revolution has become evident: (1) Removal of the old power in the centre; (2) seizure of power by the bourgeoisie, the proletariat not being prepared to handle the gigantic general problems of state; (3) spread of the revolution locally; (4) local communes, particularly in workers' centres, and development of revolutionary energy of the masses; (5) confiscation of the land, etc.; (6) control over the factories; (7) single power; (8) local, municipal revolution in progress; (9) bureaucratisation, submission to the bourgeoisie in the centre.

Conclusions: (1) Preparatory work in the centre (preparation of forces for the new revolution); (2) move the revolution forward (power? land? factories?) locally; (3) local communes, *i. e.*, complete local autonomy; local initiative; no police, no bureaucracy, all power to the armed worker and peasant masses; (4) struggle against the bureaucratising and bourgeois-pacifying influence of the petty-bourgeois elements; (5) utilisation of local experience to *push* the centre; local institutions serving as models; (6) explain to the masses of workers, soldiers, and peasants that the reason for the success of the revolution locally is concentration of power and dictatorship of the proletariat; (7) of course, at the centre this will be more difficult, and will require time; (8) development of the revolution through communes, formed in the suburbs and blocks of large cities; (9) in capitals, etc., they are turning into "satellites of the bourgeoisie."

Written May 7-8, 1917.

First published in the *Lenin Collection*, IV, 1925.

THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL [MAY] CONFERENCE OF
THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

FROM MAY 7 TO MAY 12, 1917¹⁵⁹

First published in 1925 in *The Petrograd City Conference and the All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, April [May], 1917.* (In Russian.)

К солдатам и матросам

Братья-солдаты! Братия-матросы!
Сейчас коммунисты, бывшие в "Рабе"
и теперь "Русской Часовой", будут сражаться за вас.
Но это коммунисты сейчас и не будут
заниматься чужими делами. Их всего 30 тысяч
и они будут.

Таким образом большевики
будут, поскольку они коммунисты, бороться
свои политические интересы и это неизбежно.
Их задача все военные подразделения
^(командование, управление) и
гражданские управы должны, ^{когда это нужно}
работают ^{и то}, с теми же представителями,
как и в тех коммунистических управах,
как, будущий советский советский
войск, будущий советский советский

Больше этого, наше братство "брата"
с гражданским управлением ^{и управой} матросов

Facsimile of the First Page of Lenin's Article, "To the Soldiers and Sailors," April, 1917 (see p. 183).

THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL [MAY] CONFERENCE OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

I

SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE ON MAY 7, 1917

COMRADES: In the midst of the Russian Revolution and a developing international revolution, we have assembled here as the first conference of the proletarian party. The time is approaching when the assertion of the founders of scientific Socialism, as well as the unanimous forecast of the Socialists gathered at the Basle Congress, to the effect that World War would inevitably lead to revolution is being proven correct everywhere.

In the nineteenth century Marx and Engels, observing the proletarian movement in various countries and analysing the possible prospects for a social revolution, repeatedly asserted that the rôles would, in general, be distributed among the various countries in proportion to, and in accord with, the national historic peculiarities of each of them. Briefly formulated, they expressed their idea in this way: The French worker will begin, the German will finish.

The great honour of beginning the revolution has fallen to the Russian proletariat. The Russian proletariat must not forget, however, that its movement and revolution are only part of a world-wide revolutionary proletarian movement, which in Germany, for example, is gaining momentum with every passing day. Only from this angle can we define our tasks.

I declare the All-Russian Conference open. The election of a Presidium is in order.

II

REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION, MAY 7, 1917

COMRADES: In evaluating the present moment I am forced to deal with an exceedingly broad subject. To my mind, this subject falls into three parts: first, the estimate of the political situation proper,

here in Russia, our relation to the government and to the dual power that has come into existence; second, our stand on the war; third, the international situation of the working class movement, a situation which has put the workers of the world face to face with a Socialist revolution.

Some of the points require, I think, only brief discussion. Besides, I am going to offer to this Conference a draft of a resolution covering all these questions. But I may as well tell you that because of the extreme lack of forces at our disposal, as well as because of the political crisis that had been created here, in Petrograd, we were unable either to have preliminary discussions of the resolution, or to communicate it in advance to the local comrades. I repeat, then, these are only tentative projects, calculated to lighten the labour of the commission and to enable it to concentrate on a few of the most essential questions.

I begin with the first question. If I am not mistaken, the Moscow Conference adopted the same resolution as the Petrograd City Conference (*Voces: "With amendments"*). I have not seen the amendments, and I cannot say anything about them. But since the Petrograd resolution was published in the *Soldatskaia Pravda*¹⁶⁰, I take it for granted, if there are no objections, that it is known to everybody here. I submit this resolution, as a tentative one, to the present All-Russian Conference.

The majority of the parties in the petty-bourgeois bloc dominating the Petrograd Soviet picture our policy, as distinguished from their own, as a rapid-fire policy. What really distinguishes our policy is the fact that we demand above everything else a precise class characterisation of current events. The fundamental sin of the petty-bourgeois bloc is that it resorts to phrases to conceal from the people the truth about the class character of the government.

If the Moscow comrades have any amendments to make, they may read them now.

(*Reads the resolution of the Petrograd City Conference on the attitude toward the Provisional Government.*)

Whereas: (1) The Provisional Government, by its class character, is the organ of landowner and bourgeois domination; and,

Whereas: (2) The Provisional Government and the classes it represents are bound with indissoluble economic and political ties to Russian and Anglo-French imperialism; and,

Whereas: (3) The Provisional Government does not fully carry out even the programme which it has promulgated, and when it does, it is only because

of the pressure of the revolutionary proletariat and, partly, the petty bourgeoisie; and,

Whereas: (4) The forces of the bourgeois and feudal counter-revolution, now in the process of organisation, have already, under the cover of the Provisional Government, and with its obvious encouragement, launched an attack on revolutionary democracy; and,

Whereas: (5) The Provisional Government is postponing the calling of elections to the Constituent Assembly, is interfering with the general arming of the people, is opposing the transfer of the land to the people, is foisting upon it the landowner's way of settling the agrarian question, is blocking the introduction of an eight-hour workday, is condoning counter-revolutionary propaganda in the army by Guchkov and Co., is organising the high commanding officers of the army against the soldiers, etc. . . .

I have read the first part of the resolution containing a class characterisation of the Provisional Government. As far as one is able to judge from the text of the resolution, the differences between this and the resolution of the Moscow comrades are hardly essential. Still, the general characterisation of the Provisional Government as counter-revolutionary is, in my opinion, incorrect. If we speak in general, we must specify which revolution we mean. From the standpoint of the bourgeois revolution, this cannot be said; for the bourgeois revolution has already been completed. From the standpoint of the proletarian and peasant revolution, such a statement is premature, for we cannot at all be sure that the peasants will necessarily advance farther than the bourgeoisie. To express our confidence in the peasantry, particularly now that it has turned to imperialism and defencism, *i. e.*, to supporting the war, is in my judgment unsound. At the present moment the peasantry has entered into a number of agreements with the Cadets. That is why I regard this point in the Moscow resolution as politically incorrect. We want the peasants to advance farther than the bourgeoisie, we want them to take the land from the landowners, but so far we can say nothing definite about their future conduct.

We carefully avoid the words "revolutionary democracy." When we speak of a government attack, we may use this expression. At the present moment, however, this expression covers a huge lie, for it is very difficult to distinguish the classes that have become blended in this chaos. Our task is to free those that are trailing behind. The Soviets are important for us not as a form; rather is it important to see what classes the Soviets represent. We must therefore do a great deal of work to clarify the class consciousness of the proletariat. . . .

(*Resumes the reading of the resolution.*)

Whereas: (6) The government, while doing this, is relying at the present moment on the confidence and, to a certain extent, on the actual consent of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which now comprises an undoubted majority of workers and soldiers, *i. e.*, peasants; and,

Whereas: (7) Each step made by the Provisional Government, both in the realm of its domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes not only of the city and village proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also of the petty bourgeoisie, to the real nature of this government;

The Conference resolves that:

(1) In order to accomplish the passing of the state power into the hands of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies or of other organs that are the direct expression of the will of the people, it is necessary to do extensive work in clarifying proletarian class consciousness and in uniting the city and village proletarians against petty-bourgeois vacillation, for it is only work of this nature that will assure the successful advance of the whole revolutionary people; and that

(2) Such work requires comprehensive activity within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, an increase in the number of Soviets, an increase in their power, a welding together, within the Soviets, of the proletarian internationalist groups of our party; and

(3) We must organise more effectively our Social-Democratic forces, in order that we may direct the new wave of the revolutionary movement under the banner of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Here is the crux of our policy. The whole petty bourgeoisie is wavering at present and trying to conceal this wavering under the phrase "revolutionary democracy." We must contrast these wavering with a proletarian line. The counter-revolutionists wish to frustrate it through premature action. Our task is to increase the number of Soviets, to increase their strength, to solidify the unity of our party.

The Moscow comrades have added to Point 3 the demand for control. This control is represented by Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Steklov, and other leaders of the petty-bourgeois bloc. Control without power is one of the emptiest phrases. How can I control England? To control her, one must seize her fleet. I can see how the uneducated mass of workers and soldiers may naively and unintelligently believe in control. It is sufficient, however, to ponder a while over the fundamental aspects of control to realise that such a belief constitutes a complete abandonment of the basic principles of class-struggle. What is control? If I write a scrap of paper, a resolution, they will write a counter-resolution. To control, one must have power. If the broad masses in the petty-bourgeois bloc do not understand this, we must have the patience to explain it to them, but under no circumstances must we tell them an untruth.

If, however, I obscure this fundamental issue by merely speaking of control, then I am guilty of telling an untruth and am playing into the hands of the capitalists and the imperialists. "You may do all the controlling you want, but it is we who have the guns. We'll let you be satisfied with your control," they say. They know that at the present moment the people cannot be denied anything. Control without power is a petty-bourgeois phrase that blocks the march and development of the Russian Revolution. That is why I object to the third point of the Moscow comrades.

As regards the unique tangle of two powers, whereby the Provisional Government, devoid of power, guns, soldiers, and armed masses of people, leans on the Soviets, and whereby the Soviets, relying thus far on promises, are carrying out a policy of sustaining those promises—well, if you insist on participating in this game, you are doomed to failure. It is not for us to take part in this game. We shall keep up our work of explaining to the proletariat the unsoundness of such a policy, and day by day life itself will prove the correctness of our position. So far we are in the minority; the masses do not trust us yet. We can wait; they will side with us when the Government reveals its true nature. The vacillation of the government may repel them, then they will rush to our side; then, taking account of the new correlation of forces, we shall say: Our time has come.

I now pass on to the question of war. It is this question that actually united us, when we took a stand against the Loan. It is the attitude on this question that showed immediately and clearly the alignment of political forces. As the *Riech* has stated, everybody, except the *Yedinstvo*, is wavering; the petty-bourgeois mass is all for the Loan—with reservations. The capitalists make a sour face, they snickeringly pocket the resolution, saying: "You may do the talking, but we will do the acting." All those now voting for the Loan are known as social-chauvinists the world over.

I will now proceed to read the resolution on the war. It consists of three parts: First, characterisation of the war from the stand-point of its class significance; second, the revolutionary defencism of the masses, something that cannot be found in any country; third, how to end the war.

Many of us, myself included, have had occasion to address the people, particularly the soldiers, and it seems to me that even when everything is explained to them from the point of view of class

interests, there is still one thing in our position that they cannot fully grasp, namely, in what way we intend to finish the war, in what way we think it possible to bring the war to an end. The masses are in a maze of misapprehension, there is an absolute lack of understanding as to our stand, that is why we must be particularly clear in this case.

(*Reads the draft of the resolution on the war.*)

The present war is, on the part of both belligerent groups, an imperialist war, *i. e.*, it is waged by capitalists for domination over the world, for the division of spoils by capitalists, for profitable markets for finance and bank capital, and for the strangulation of weak nationalities.

The passing of state power in Russia from Nicholas II to the government of Guchkov, Lvov and others, to the government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter this class character and meaning of Russia's participation in the war.

The fact that the new government is carrying on the same imperialist, *i. e.*, grabbing, predatory war, became particularly apparent when the government not only failed to publish the secret treaties concluded between the late Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of England, France, etc., but formally confirmed these treaties. This was done without consulting the will of the people and with the clear purpose of deceiving it, for it is well known that the treaties concluded by the late Tsar are predatory through and through, that they promise the Russian capitalists freedom to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc.

For this reason a proletarian party can support neither the present war, nor the present government, nor its loans, no matter in what glowing terms the loans may be spoken of, unless our party break completely with internationalism, *i. e.*, with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all lands in their struggle against the yoke of capital.

Nor can confidence be placed in the promise of the present government to renounce annexations, *i. e.*, conquest of foreign countries, or in the promise to renounce forcible retention within the confines of Russia of this or that nationality.

For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound by thousands of threads of Russian and Anglo-French bank capital, and intent on protecting the interests of capital, cannot renounce annexations in the present war without at the same time ceasing to be capitalists, without renouncing the profits on the billions invested in loans, in concessions, in war industries, etc. And, in the second place, the new government, having renounced annexations in order to deceive the people, declared through Miliukov (Moscow, April 22, 1917), that it had no intentions of renouncing annexations. Finally, according to an exposé in the *Dielo Naroda*, a newspaper published with the collaboration of Minister Kerensky, Miliukov has not even sent abroad his statement concerning the renunciation of annexations.

In warning the people against the empty promises of the capitalists, the conference therefore declares that it is necessary to distinguish sharply between a renunciation of annexations in words, and a renunciation of annexations in deed, *i. e.*, the immediate publication of all the secret, predatory treaties, of all notes and documents pertaining to foreign policy, and the taking of immediate steps to free all the peoples which the capitalist class, continuing

the disgraceful policy of the late Tsar Nicholas II, oppresses, forcibly keeps bound to Russia, or keeps in a state of subjection.

The second half of this part of the resolution deals with the promises made by the government. Perhaps for a Marxist this part would be superfluous; for the people, however, it is important. We therefore ought to add our reason why we have no faith in those promises, why we should not trust the government. The present government's promises to abandon its imperialist policy deserve no credence. Our policy in this case should not be merely to demand that the government publish the treaties. This would be a vain hope. To demand this of a capitalist government would be equivalent to demanding that it expose commercial swindling. Since we maintain that it is necessary to renounce annexations and indemnities, we ought to indicate how this can be done; and if we are asked who can do it, our answer is that since the remedy is by its very nature a revolutionary one, it is only the revolutionary proletariat that can apply it. Otherwise these promises will remain empty pledges and wishes whereby the capitalists deceive the people.

(Continues reading the draft of the resolution.)

The so-called "revolutionary defencism" which in Russia has permeated all the Narodnik parties (People's Socialists, Trudoviks, Socialists-Revolutionists), as well as the opportunist party of the Social-Democratic Mensheviks (O. C., Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the unaffiliated revolutionists, represents, by its class character, on the one hand the interests and the standpoint of the petty bourgeoisie, the petty proprietors, and the wealthier peasants, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples; on the other hand, it is the outcome of the deception of the masses by the capitalists, who refuse to make public the secret treaties and who try to get off with promises and rhetoric.

We are bound to admit that a very great number among the "revolutionary defencists" are honest, *i. e.*, they are honestly opposed to annexations, to conquests, to doing violence to weak peoples; they are honestly striving to attain a democratic and non-oppressive peace among all the belligerents. This cannot be denied for the reason that the class position of the proletarians and the semi-proletarians of city and village (*i. e.*, of the people who earn their livelihood, wholly or partly, by selling their labour power to the capitalists) renders these classes indifferent to the profits of the capitalists.

Therefore, the conference, recognising any concessions to "revolutionary defencism" as absolutely not permissible and as actually signifying a complete break with internationalism and Socialism, declares at the same time that so long as the Russian capitalists and their Provisional Government confine themselves to threats of violence against the people (for example, Guchkov's notorious decree threatening the soldiers with punishment for arbitrary removal of superiors), as long as the capitalists have not started the use of violence against the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', Agricultural Workers', and other Deputies which organise themselves freely, elect and remove all

public officers freely,—so long will our party preach general abstention from violence, at the same time fighting solely by means of comrade persuasion against the deep and fatal error of "revolutionary defencism," emphasising the truth that the attitude of uncritical confidence in the government of the capitalists, the bitterest enemies of peace and Socialism, is, in present-day Russia, the greatest obstacle to a speedy conclusion of the war.

A section of the petty bourgeoisie is interested, no doubt, in this policy of the capitalists. This is the reason why the proletarian party at present must not place any hopes on the community of interests of the proletariat and the peasantry. We are striving to win the peasantry over to our side; the peasantry, however, is more or less consciously on the side of the capitalists.

We have no doubt that, as a class, the proletariat and semi-proletariat are not interested in the war. They are influenced by tradition and deception. They still lack political experience. Therefore, our task is patient explaining. Our principles remain intact, we do not make the slightest compromise; yet we cannot approach those masses as we approach the social-chauvinists. Those elements of our population have never been Socialists, they have not the slightest conception of Socialism, they are just awakening to political life. But their class-consciousness is growing and broadening with extraordinary rapidity. One must know how to approach them with explanations, and this is now the most difficult task, particularly for a party that but yesterday was underground.

Some may ask: Have we not repudiated our own principles? We have been advocating the turning of the imperialist war into civil war, and now we have reversed ourselves. We must bear in mind, however, that the first civil war in Russia has come to an end; we are now advancing toward the second war,—the war between imperialism and the armed people. In this transitional period, as long as the armed force is in the hands of the soldiers, as long as Miliukov and Guchkov have not resorted to violence, this civil war turns for us into peaceful, extensive, and patient class propaganda. To speak of civil war before people have come to realise the need of it, is undoubtedly to fall into Blanquism. We are for civil war, but for civil war waged by a class-conscious proletariat. Only he can be overthrown who is known to the people as a despot. There are no despots in Russia at the present moment; it is the soldiers and not the capitalists who are in possession of the guns and cannons; the capitalists are in power not by force but by deception, and to speak of violence now is pure nonsense. One

must know how to look from the Marxist standpoint which says that the imperialist war will turn into civil war as a result of objective conditions, and not as a result of subjective desires. For the time being we lay aside this slogan, but only for the time being. It is the soldiers and the workers who are in possession of the arms now, not the capitalists. So long as the government has not started fighting, our propaganda is peaceful.

The government would like to see us make the first reckless step towards decisive action, as this would be to its advantage. It is exasperated because our party has advanced the slogan of peaceful demonstration. We must not cede one iota of our principles to the watchfully waiting petty bourgeoisie. The proletarian party would be guilty of the most grievous error if it shaped its policy on the basis of subjective desires where organisation is required. We cannot assert that the majority is with us; in this case our motto should be: caution, caution, caution. To base our proletarian policy on overconfidence means to condemn it to failure.

The third point deals with the question of how to end the war. The Marxian point of view is well known, the difficulty is how to present this view to the masses in the clearest form possible. We are not pacifists, and we cannot repudiate a revolutionary war. Wherein does a revolutionary war differ from a capitalist war? The difference is, above all, a class difference: Which class is interested in the war? What policy does the interested class pursue in that war? . . . In approaching the masses, we must offer concrete answers to all questions. First, then, how can one distinguish between a revolutionary war and a capitalist war? The rank and file of the masses do not grasp the distinction, do not realise that there is here a class distinction. Our explanations must not be confined to theories only, we must demonstrate in practice that we shall wage a really revolutionary war when the proletariat is in power. Putting the matter thus, we offer, I think, the clearest possible answer to the questions as to the nature of the war and of those who are carrying it on.

The *Pravda* has published the draft of an appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries. Information has been reaching us concerning fraternisation on the front, but this fraternisation is as yet more or less elemental. What it lacks is a conscious political idea. The soldiers have come to feel instinctively that action must come from the bottom; their class instinct of people in a revolu-

tionary mood made them feel that this was the only right path to follow. For a revolution, however, this is insufficient. We must supply a clear-cut political issue. In order to make an end of this war, all power must pass to the revolutionary class. I would suggest that an appeal to the soldiers of all the warring countries be drawn up in the name of the conference and published in all the languages. If, instead of all these current phrases about peace conferences, fifty per cent of whose members are either secret or avowed agents of imperialist governments, we send out this appeal, it will bring us to our goal a thousand times sooner than all those peace conferences. We refuse to have any dealings with the German Plekhanovs. When we were crossing Germany, those gentlemen, the social-chauvinists, the German Plekhanovs, were clambering into our cars, but we told them that we would not allow a single one of them to enter our car, and that if any of them dared to enter they would not escape without a terrific scandal. Had a man like Karl Liebknecht been permitted to come to see us, we would have certainly talked matters over with him. When we issue our appeal to the toilers of all the countries, when we offer a definite answer to the question as to how to end the war, when the soldiers read our answer suggesting a political way out of this war, then fraternisation will make a tremendous stride forward. This we must do in order to elevate fraternisation from an instinctive revulsion against war to a clear political understanding as to how to get out of it.

I now pass to the third question, *i. e.*, the analysis of the present moment with reference to the position of the international labour movement and that of international capitalism. When a Marxist discusses imperialism he realises the utter absurdity of dwelling on conditions in one single country, for he knows that all capitalist countries are closely bound together. During the present war this bond has grown immeasurably stronger. All humanity is kneaded into one bloody lump, and no one separate nation can disentangle itself from it. Though there are more and less advanced countries, the present war has bound all of them to each other by so many threads, that it appears senseless and impossible for any one separate country to strive to escape this tangle.

We are all agreed that power should be in the hands of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. But what can and what must they do if power passes to them, *i. e.*, if it is in the hands of

proletarians and semi-proletarians? We are confronted with an involved and difficult problem. Indeed, with regard to the transfer of power, we are aware of one danger that has played a disastrous rôle in former revolutions, namely, the revolutionary class not knowing what to do with power after it has gained it. History offers many examples of revolutions that failed because of this. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, spreading the network of their organisation over all of Russia, are at this moment the central force of the revolution; it seems to me, however, that we have not sufficiently studied or understood them. Should they seize power, they would constitute a state not in the ordinary sense of that word. The world has never yet seen such a state functioning for any considerable length of time, but the proletarian movement of the world has been approaching such a state. That state would be constructed on the pattern of the Paris Commune. Such power is a dictatorship, *i.e.*, it rests not on the law, not on the formal will of the majority, but on direct and open force. Force is the instrument of power. How, then, will the Soviets apply this power? Will they revert to the old way of governing by police? Will they carry on the government by means of the old organs of power? This they cannot do, I think. At any rate, they will be faced with the immediate task of creating a state that is not bourgeois. Among Bolsheviks, I have compared this state to the Paris Commune in the sense that the latter had destroyed the old administrative organs and had replaced them by perfectly new ones that were direct and immediate organs of the workers. I am blamed for using a word now exceedingly frightening to the capitalists, for they have begun to interpret it as a desire for the immediate introduction of Socialism. I have used it, however, only in the sense of replacing old organs by new proletarian organs. Marx regarded that as the greatest advance of the proletarian movement of the world. To us the question of the social tasks of the proletariat is of enormous practical importance, first, because we are at the present moment bound up with all the other countries, and are unable to free ourselves from this tangle, that is to say, the proletariat will either free itself as a whole or it will be crushed; secondly, the existence of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is an established fact. No one doubts that they have spread over the whole of Russia, that they are a state power and that there can be no other power. If this is so, then we ought to make clear to ourselves how the Soviets are likely to

use their power. It is asserted that the power of the Soviets is the same as in France or America, but there is nothing like it in those countries; such a direct power does not exist there.

The resolution on the political situation consists of three parts.¹⁶¹ The first defines the objective situation created by the imperialist war, and the situation in which world capitalism finds itself; the second deals with the present state of the international proletarian movement; the third deals with the tasks of the Russian workers in case they assume power. In the first part I formulate the conclusion that during the present war capitalism has developed even more than before the war. It is now in control of entire realms of production. As early as in 1891, *i. e.*, twenty-seven years ago, when the Germans adopted the Erfurt programme,¹⁶² Engels maintained that capitalism could not be regarded any longer as being planless. This idea has become obsolete; once there are trusts, planlessness disappears. It is particularly in the twentieth century that capitalism has made gigantic strides, and the war has accomplished what could not otherwise have been accomplished in twenty-five years. Nationalisation of industry has advanced not only in Germany, but also in England. Monopoly, in general, has evolved into state monopoly.

General conditions show that the war has accelerated the development of capitalism; it advanced from capitalism to imperialism; from monopoly to nationalisation. All this made the Socialist revolution closer and created the objective conditions for it. Thus the course of the war has brought the Socialist revolution nearer to us.

Before the war England was the freest country in the world,—a point always stressed by the politicians of our Cadet type. There was freedom in England, because there was no revolutionary movement there. But the war has changed everything. In a country where for decades there was not a single instance of interference with the Socialist press, a typically tsarist censorship was established, and English prisons became crowded with Socialists. For centuries the capitalists of England acquired the habit of ruling the people without the use of force, and if they now resort to force, it shows that they have come to feel that the revolutionary movement is growing, and that they cannot do otherwise. When we pointed out that Liebknecht represented the masses, in spite of the fact that there were a hundred German Plekhanovs to one

Liebknecht, we were told that that was a Utopia, an illusion. Yet, any one who visited workingmen's meetings abroad knows that the sympathy of the masses for Liebknecht is an undeniable fact. His bitterest opponents had to practice cunning when they faced the masses. When they could not pretend to be his friends, they said nothing, they did not dare to say anything against him. Now the cause has advanced still farther. We are now witnessing mass strikes, and there is fraternisation at the front. Prophecies in this respect would be dangerously misleading; we cannot fail to notice, however, that sympathy with the International is growing, that a revolutionary fermentation is beginning in the German army. These facts tend to indicate that revolution in Germany is rising.

What, then, are the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat? The main flaw, the main error, in all Socialist discussions is that this question is put in too general a form,—the transition to Socialism. What we should discuss are concrete steps and measures. Some of these are ripe, some are not. We are now in the midst of a transition period. Clearly, we have brought to the fore new forms, forms different from those to be found in bourgeois states. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are a form of state without any parallel. It is a form that represents the first steps toward Socialism, and is inevitable as the first stage in the development of a Socialist society. This is a fact of decisive importance. The Russian Revolution has created the Soviets. No bourgeois country in the world has or can have such state institutions. No Socialist revolution can function with any other state power. The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies must seize power not for the purpose of building an ordinary bourgeois republic, nor for the purpose of introducing Socialism immediately. The latter could not be accomplished. What, then, is the purpose? They must seize power in order to take the first concrete steps towards introducing Socialism, steps that can and should be made. In this case fear is the greatest enemy. The masses should be convinced that these steps must be taken immediately, that otherwise the power of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies would be devoid of meaning, and would offer nothing to the people.

I shall now attempt to answer the question as to what concrete measures we may propose to the people that would not be contrary to our Marxist conviction.

Why do we wish that power should pass to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies?

The first thing the Soviets must accomplish is the nationalisation of the land. Nationalisation is being spoken of by all the peoples. Some say it is a most utopian measure, still, everybody comes to regard it as inevitable, because land ownership in Russia is so complicated that there is no other solution except the removal of all boundary lines and the making of all land the property of the state. Private ownership of land must be abolished. This is our first task, because the majority of the people are for it. To accomplish this, we need the Soviets. This measure cannot be carried out by means of the old government bureaucracy.

The second measure. We cannot stand for the "introduction" of Socialism—this would be sheer nonsense. We must *preach* Socialism. The majority of the population in Russia consists of peasants, of petty proprietors, who cannot even conceive of Socialism. But what objections can they have to a bank's being established in each village, to enable them to improve their husbandry? They can have nothing against such a measure. We must make propaganda in favour of these practical measures among the peasants, we must make the peasants realise that they are needed.

Quite another thing is the sugar syndicate. Here our proposal must be of immediate practicability: these fully developed syndicates must be taken over by the state. If the Soviets wish to assume power, it is only for such ends. There is no other reason why the Soviets should assume power. The matter may be stated thus: either the Soviets develop, or they die an ignominious death, like the Paris Commune. For a bourgeois republic we need no Soviets; Cadets will do.

I shall conclude by referring to the speech that made the strongest impression on me. I heard a coal miner deliver a remarkable speech. Without using a single bookish word, he told how they had made the revolution. Those miners were not concerned with the question as to whether or not they should have a president. They seized the mine, and the important question to them was how to keep the cables intact so that production might not be interrupted. Then came the question of bread, of which there was a scarcity. And the miners again agreed on the method of obtaining it. Now this is a real programme of the revolution, not derived from books. This is a real seizure of power locally. Nowhere in Russia has the

bourgeoisie assumed such a definite shape as it has in Petrograd. Here the capitalists have the power in their hands. But throughout the country, the peasants, without assigning themselves special Socialist tasks, are carrying out purely practical measures. It is this programme of the revolutionary movement that indicates, I think, the true path of the revolution. These measures, we hold, must be carried out with the greatest caution and circumspection. But it is only these measures that are really worth while, it is only they that point the way forward; without them there is no escape. Without them the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies will be dispersed, will die an ignominious death. But if the revolutionary proletariat should actually win power, it will be solely in order to advance. To advance, however, means to take definite steps. Words, alone, won't get us out of the war. The complete success of these steps is possible only through a world revolution, when the revolution smothers the war, when the workers of the world support the revolution. The seizure of power is, therefore, the only practical measure,—this is the only way out.

III

CONCLUDING REMARKS IN CONNECTION WITH THE REPORT ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION, MAY 7, 1917

COMRADE KAMENEV was cleverly riding his hobby when he spoke of adventurousness.¹⁶³ We must dwell on it for a moment. Comrade Kamenev is convinced that he is right when he asserts that our opposition to the slogan, "Down with the Provisional Government," betrayed vacillation. I agree with him; there certainly have been deviations from a straightforward revolutionary policy; these deviations must be avoided in the future. I think that our differences with Comrade Kamenev are not very grave. Indeed, by agreeing with us, he has changed his position. Wherein were we adventurers? It was in the attempt to resort to forcible measures. We did not know the extent to which the masses had swung to our side during that troublous moment. Had it swung powerfully, it would have been an entirely different matter. We advocated peaceful demonstrations. But several comrades from the Petrograd Committee issued an entirely different slogan. We decided against that slogan, but had no time to prevent its use; the masses followed the slogan of the Petrograd Committee. We say that the slogan,

"Down with the Provisional Government," is an adventurer's slogan; that the government cannot as yet be overthrown. That is why we have advocated peaceful demonstrations. All we wanted was a peaceful reconnoitering of the enemy's forces; we did not want to give battle. The Petrograd Committee, however, turned a trifle to the Left. In a case of this sort, such a step was a grave crime. Our organisational apparatus proved too weak; not all are carrying out our instructions. Together with the correct slogan, "Long Live the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies," there was the incorrect slogan, "Down with the Provisional Government." In time of action, the deviation to the Left was wrong. We regard this as the greatest crime, as disorganisation. Had we deliberately allowed such an act, we would not have remained in the Central Committee for one moment. It happened because of the imperfection of the organisational apparatus. Yes, our organisation had flaws. Our task is to improve the organisation.

The Mensheviks and Co. tear the word "adventurers" to tatters. But they had no organisation and no policy at all. We have both an organisation and a policy.

While the bourgeoisie was mobilising all its forces, while the centre was in hiding, we organised a peaceful demonstration. We were the only ones who had a political line. Were there any errors committed? Certainly there were. Only he who does nothing commits no errors. As for a perfect organisation, this is a difficult matter.

Now about control.

We are in full accord with Comrade Kamenev, except on the question of control. He views control as a political act. Subjectively, however, he understands this word better than Chkheidze and the others. We do not accept control. People tell us that we have isolated ourselves, that by letting loose a torrent of terrible Communist phrases we have frightened the bourgeoisie into a fit. So be it! Still, it was not this that isolated us. It was the Loan question that caused our isolation. It was on this question that we found ourselves in the minority. Yes, we are in the minority. Well, what of it? To be a Socialist while chauvinism is raging all around means to be in the minority. To be in the majority means to be a chauvinist. At the present moment the peasant together with Miliukov is getting the best of Socialism by means of the Loan. The peasant follows Miliukov and Guchkov. This is a

fact. The bourgeois-democratic dictatorship of the peasantry is an old formula.

The peasant is chauvinistic. We must separate the proletariat, we must form a distinct proletarian party, if we wish to draw the peasant to the revolution. To draw the peasant now means to surrender to the mercies of Miliukov.

The Provisional Government must be overthrown, but not now, and not in the ordinary way. We agree with Comrade Kamenev. But we must explain. It is this word that nettles Comrade Kamenev. But that, nevertheless, is the only thing we can do.

Comrade Rykov says that Socialism must first come from other countries with greater industrial development. But this is not so. It is hard to tell who will begin and who will end. This is not Marxism, but a parody on Marxism.

Marx said that France would begin and that Germany would finish. But it turned out that the Russian proletariat achieved more than anybody else. . . .

Had we said: "No Tsar, but a Dictatorship of the Proletariat"—it would have meant a leap over the petty bourgeoisie. What we are saying, however, is this: help the revolution through the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. We must not degenerate into reformism. We are waging this struggle in order that we may emerge the victors, not the vanquished. At worst we count on partial success. If we suffer defeat, we shall have partial success. We shall get reforms. Reforms are an auxiliary means in the class struggle.

Furthermore, Comrade Rykov says that there is no period of transition from capitalism to Socialism. This is wrong and is a break with Marxism.

The policy which we have mapped out is sound. In the future we shall make every effort to strengthen our organisation to such an extent that there should be no Petrograd Committeemen¹⁶⁴ disobeying the Central Committee. We are growing—this is as it should be with a real party.

IV

SPEECH ON THE PROPOSED CALLING OF AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE, MAY 8, 1917¹⁶⁵

I CANNOT agree with Comrade Nogin. We are confronted here, I think, with a fact of extraordinary political importance, and we

are in duty bound to launch a vigorous campaign against the Russian and Anglo-French chauvinists who have declined Borgbjerg's invitation to participate in the conference. We ought not to overlook the essence, the meaning, of this whole affair. I am going to read to you Borgbjerg's proposal exactly as it was reported by the *Rabochaia Gazeta*. I shall point out how back of this whole comedy of a would-be Socialist congress there are actually the political manœuvres of German imperialism. The German capitalists use the German social-chauvinists for the purpose of inviting the social-chauvinists of all countries to the conference. That is why it is necessary to launch a great campaign.

Why do they do it through the Socialists? Because they want to fool the working masses. Those diplomats are subtle; to say so openly would not do, they think it more effective to utilise a Danish Plekhanov. We have seen hundreds of German chauvinists abroad; they must be exposed.

(*Reads an excerpt from the Rabochaia Gazeta, No. 39, May 8, 1917.*)

On behalf of the joint committee of the three Scandinavian labour parties (Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish), Borgbjerg, editor of the Danish Social-Democratic organ *Social-Demokraten*,¹⁶⁶ has forwarded a message to the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies inviting all the Socialist parties in Russia to send their representatives to an international Socialist conference. Because of the proximity of Denmark to Germany, Borgbjerg was able to communicate mainly with representatives of the "majority" fraction of the German Social-Democratic Party. From him the committee learned the peace terms which the official Social-Democratic Party of Germany would consider acceptable, and which its representatives would propose to the conference.

The terms follow:

First of all they subscribe to the principles laid down by the Scandinavian and Dutch Socialists at the 1915 conference, namely, the self-determination of nations, the obligation of all countries to bring their differences before an international court of arbitration, the demand for gradual disarmament. They furthermore add that the German Social-Democracy will insist upon the following:

1. All territories occupied by Germany and her allies are to be given up;
2. Russian Poland is to be granted full freedom to determine whether it wants to remain a part of Russia or to be independent;
3. Belgium is to be restored as a fully independent state;
4. Similarly, Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania are to be restored as independent states;
5. Bulgaria is to receive the Bulgarian districts of Macedonia, and Serbia is to be given access to the Adriatic Sea.

As regards Alsace-Lorraine, a peaceful agreement concerning the rectification of Lorraine's boundaries is possible; as far as the Poles of Posen are

concerned, the Germans will insist on their obtaining autonomy of national culture.

We have not the slightest doubt that this proposal comes from the German government which, instead of making a straightforward bid, resorts to the services of the Danish Plekhanovs, since, obviously, the services of the German government agents are in this case undesirable. That is why there are social-chauvinists in this world; that they may carry out such commissions. It is our task to expose to the world, in the name of the seventy thousand workers represented at this conference of a proletarian party, the underlying forces and intentions that are kept secret. It is necessary to publish a detailed resolution, to translate it into foreign languages, and thus to give a deserved rebuff to these gentlemen who dare to inject themselves into a Socialist party.

(*Reads the draft of a resolution.*) ¹⁸⁷

The Socialist papers are silent this morning. They know what they are about. They know that silence is precious. Only the *Rabochaia Gazeta* has published an article devoid of any critical analysis. On the one hand, we cannot but confess, while, on the other, we must admit. . . .

More than any one else the Russian government may be certain that this is really the work of an agent of the German government.

When we hear the incessant cries about the liberation of Alsace-Lorraine, we must remind those gentlemen that the real question at issue here is the pocket, for there is tremendous wealth in Alsace-Lorraine, and the German capitalists are fighting with the French capitalists for the division of the booty. It is to their advantage to have the Plekhanovs say that the liberation of Alsace-Lorraine is a holy cause. When the German social-chauvinists talk of a peaceful rectification of the boundaries of Alsace-Lorraine, it means peaceful division of the spoil between the French and the German imperialists.

There is one thing more I must add. I forgot to point out the fact that the German representatives of the "centre," Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour, have agreed to this conference. This deserves nothing but contempt. The English and the French Socialists have declined to attend the conference. This indicates that the Anglo-French chauvinists, who call themselves Socialists, are really agents of the bourgeoisie, because they are instrumental in continuing the imperialist war despite the tremendous efforts made by the German Socialist majority through Borgbjer; for the German government,

in using Borgbjerg, undoubtedly, says: The situation is such that I am forced to return to you your booty (the German colonies in Africa). This is confirmed by the fact that the situation in Germany is most desperate, that the country is on the brink of ruin; to carry on the war now is a hopeless task. This is the reason why they say that they are ready to give up almost all the booty, for by saying this they are still striving to retain at least something. The diplomats communicate with each other freely, while the bourgeois papers, whenever they write of foreign affairs, fool the people with phrases.

There is no doubt that when the English and the French social-chauvinists declined to attend the conference, they were familiar with all the facts. They must have gone to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs where they were told: Such and such are the underlying facts, we do not want you to go there. This is exactly what happened.

On the other hand, when the Russian soldiers receive this resolution which must be issued in the name of the seventy thousand members of our party, they will really begin to see into the whole shady affair. They will then understand that Germany is unable further to carry on its war of conquest, and that it is the purpose of the Allies completely to crush and to rob Germany. It cannot be denied that Borgbjerg is an agent of the German government.

This, comrades, is the reason why, I think, we must expose this whole comedy of the Socialist conference, expose all these congresses as comedies intended to cover up the deals made by the diplomats behind the backs of the masses. Once and for all we must tell the truth in such a way that it may be heard by the soldiers at the front and by the workers all over the world. And our campaign with regard to such proposals will serve, on the one hand, to explain our proletarian policy, and, on the other, as a series of mass actions of unprecedented dimensions. I ask you, therefore, to adopt this declaration, to forward it to the Executive Committee, to translate it into foreign languages, and to publish it in to-morrow's *Pravda*.

Comrades, it seems to me that as matters stand it would be expedient to elect an editorial commission, that is, of course, if you agree with the basic ideas of the declaration. Comrade Kamenev's resolution also appears to me acceptable, but it must be considered in connection with the question relating to the International. As

for the present, we must forthwith take practical measures to counteract the campaign initiated by Borgbjerg.¹⁶⁸

V

SPEECH ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND
SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES, MAY 8, 1917¹⁶⁹

BRIEF PRESS REPORT

LENIN pointed out that the French Revolution went through a period of municipal revolution, that it gained strength in local organs of self-government which became its mainstay. In the Russian Revolution, he observed, there has been a tendency towards bureaucracy in the centres, and a tendency to exercise greater power by local and provincial Soviets. The Soviets in the capitals are politically more dependent upon the bourgeois central government than the Soviets in the provinces. In the centres it is not so easy to take over the management of industries; in the provinces this has been partly accomplished already. Hence the conclusion that the local Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies must be strengthened. In this respect progress can be first of all achieved in the provinces.

VI

SPEECH IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION RELATING TO
THE WAR, MAY 10, 1917¹⁷⁰

COMRADES, the first draft of the resolution relating to the war was read by me at the city conference. Because of the crisis that had absorbed the attention and energy of all our comrades, we had been unable to amend the draft. But since yesterday the commission has been working on it, and the results, it appears, are satisfactory: the resolution has been changed, shortened and improved.

I wish to say a few words concerning the structure of the resolution. It consists of three parts. The first is devoted to a class analysis of the war; it also contains a statement of principles upon which our party bases its distrust of all promises made by the Provisional Government, as well as its denial of confidence in that government. The second part deals with the question of revolutionary defencism as a vast mass movement which has united against us the overwhelming majority of the people. Our task is to make

clear the class significance of this revolutionary defencism, its essence, the correlation of forces within it, and how to fight against it. The third part of the resolution deals with the question of how to end the war. This practical question, which is of supreme importance to our party, requires a detailed answer. We think that we have succeeded in meeting this requirement satisfactorily. The many articles on the war published in the *Pravda* and in the provincial newspapers (which reach us very irregularly, postal service being disorganised, and provincial papers reaching the Central Committee only occasionally) reveal a negative attitude toward the war and the Loan. I think that the vote against the Loan settled the question as to our opposition to revolutionary defencism. I think it is unnecessary to discuss this in greater detail.

The present war is, on the part of both belligerent groups, an imperialist war, *i. e.*, it is waged by the capitalists for the division of the benefits derived from the domination of the world, for markets, for finance (bank) capital, for the subjection of weak nationalities, etc.

The first and basic point is the question of the meaning of the war, a question of a general and political character, a question on which there is disagreement, a question which the capitalists and the social-chauvinists most carefully evade. This is the reason why we must consider it first in order and make an addition.

Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries. In Russia, moreover, the prolongation of the war involves a grave danger to the conquests of the revolution and its further development.

The passing of state power, in Russia, into the hands of the Provisional Government, a government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and meaning of Russia's participation in the war.

The words I have just read to you are of great importance in our propaganda and agitation. Has the class character of the war changed? Could it change? Our reply is based on the fact that power has passed to the government of the landowners and the capitalists, the groups that prepared this war. We then pass on to one of the facts that reveals most clearly the character of the war. Class interests as expressed by the general policy carried on for decades by definite classes, are one thing; the obvious class character of the war is another.

This fact became particularly apparent when the new government not only failed to publish the secret treaties concluded between the late Tsar and the

capitalist governments of England, France, etc., but even formally and without consulting the people, confirmed these secret treaties, which promised Russian capitalists freedom to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc. The concealment of these treaties from the people completely deceived them as to the true character of the war.

And so, I emphasise again, we are pointing out one particularly striking confirmation of our analysis of the character of the war. Even if there were no treaties at all, the character of the war would be the same, because capitalist groups can come to an agreement without any treaties. But the treaties exist; their meaning is self-evident; for the purposes of co-ordinating the work of our agitators and propagandists, the fact of their existence must be especially emphasised. This is why we have made a special point of it. The people's attention is and should be called to this fact, all the more so because the treaties were concluded by the Tsar who has been overthrown. The people's attention ought to be called to the fact that the present governments are carrying on the war on the basis of treaties concluded between the old governments. This, I feel, makes the contradiction between the capitalist interests and the will of the people stand out most strikingly, and it is for the agitators to expose these contradictions, to call the people's attention to them, to strive to explain them to the masses by appealing to their class consciousness. Inasmuch as all the governments keep these treaties secret, we infer that the treaties doubtless hold out the promise of enormous profits to the capitalists, to be derived from robbing other countries. There is not a republic in the world whose foreign policy is conducted in the open. While the capitalist system exists, it is fatuous to expect the capitalists to open their ledgers. While there is private ownership of the means of production, there is bound to be private ownership of stocks and financial operations. The cornerstone of contemporary diplomacy is financial operations, which in their final analysis mean the robbing and the crushing of weaker nationalities. From our point of view, these are the fundamental premises upon which our evaluation of the war rests. Starting with them, we come to the following conclusion:

For this reason a proletarian party can support neither the present war, nor the present government, nor its loans, without breaking completely with internationalism, i. e., with the fraternal solidarity of the workers of all lands in their struggle against the yoke of capital.

This is our chief and basic method. It determines our whole policy, and it differentiates us from all the other parties, regardless

of how Socialist they claim to be. This principle seems to us irrefutable, and it predetermines our attitude toward all the other political parties. Next follows a statement concerning the extravagant promises made by the government. Around these promises a prolonged campaign is carried on by the Soviets who have become themselves entangled in these promises, which are very trying to the people. We have, therefore, deemed it necessary to add to our purely objective analysis of the class relations an analysis of those promises,—promises which in themselves have, of course, no significance in the eyes of a Marxist, but which mean a great deal to the people, and mean still more in politics. The Petrograd Soviet has become entangled in these promises, has added weight to them by promising its support. This is the reason why we add the following statement:

No confidence can be placed in the promises of the present government to renounce annexations, *i.e.*, conquests of foreign countries, or in the promise to renounce forcible retention within the confines of Russia of this or that nationality.

Since the word "annexation" is foreign, we have given it an exact political definition, such as neither the Cadet party nor the petty-bourgeois democratic parties (the Narodniks and Mensheviks) could possibly give. Few words have been used so meaninglessly and so carelessly.

For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound by thousands of threads of banking capital, cannot renounce annexations in the present war without renouncing the profits on the billions invested in loans, in concessions, in war industries, etc. And, in the second place, the new government, having renounced annexations in order to deceive the people, declared through Miliukov (Moscow, April 22, 1917), that it had no intentions of renouncing annexations, and, in the note of May 1 and in the explanations of it of May 5, confirmed the annexationist character of its policy.

In warning the people against the empty promises of the capitalists, the conference, therefore, declares that it is necessary to distinguish sharply between a renunciation of annexations in words and a renunciation of annexations in deed, *i.e.*, the immediate publication and abrogation of all the secret, predatory treaties, and the immediate granting to all nationalities of the right to determine by free voting whether they wish to be independent states or to be part of any other state.

We have found it necessary to point out the foregoing, because the question of peace without annexations is the fundamental question in all discussions of peace terms. All parties recognise that peace will become the paramount issue, and that peace with annexa-

tions will be an unheard-of catastrophe for all countries. In a country where there is political freedom, the question of peace cannot be placed before the people otherwise than in terms of peace without annexations. It is therefore necessary to declare in favour of peace without annexations, at the same time lying by using the word "annexations" in a very vague sense, or evading the question altogether. The *Riech*, for instance, cries that the return of Courland to Russia means renunciation of annexations. When I spoke before the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, one soldier handed me a slip of paper with the following question: "We are forced to fight to win back Courland. Does reconquering of Courland mean fighting for annexations?" I was forced to reply affirmatively. We are against Germany's forcible annexation of Courland, but we are also against Russia's forcible retention of Courland. For example, our government has issued a manifesto proclaiming the independence of Poland. The manifesto is full of meaningless phrases. It does, however, state that Poland must form a free military alliance with Russia. These three words contain the whole truth. A free military alliance of little Poland with huge Russia is, in point of fact, complete military subjection of Poland. Poland may be granted freedom politically; its boundaries, however, will be determined by the military alliance.

If we fight to insure the supremacy of the Russian capitalists over the former territories of Courland and Poland, then the German capitalists have the right to rob Courland. They may argue this way: At the end of the eighteenth century you and we looted Poland together. Prussia then was a very small and a very weak country; Russia was strong, therefore Russia grabbed more. Now we have grown stronger and it is our purpose, if you please, to snatch a larger share. It is impossible to refute this capitalist logic. In 1863 Japan was a mere zero in comparison with Russia, but in 1905 Japan thrashed Russia. In 1863-1873 Germany was a mere zero in comparison with England, but now Germany is stronger than England. The Germans may argue: We were weak when Courland was taken from us; we have now grown stronger than you, and we wish to take it back. Not to renounce annexations means to justify the interminable wars conducted for the conquest of weak nationalities. To renounce annexations means to let each people determine freely whether it wants to live separately or together with others. Of course, for this purpose, the armies must be with-

drawn. To manifest the slightest hesitation in the matter of annexations means to encourage endless wars. It follows that in this matter we allow no hesitation. With regard to annexations, our answer is—free decision of the peoples. But how can we secure economic freedom alongside this political freedom? To accomplish this, power must pass into the hands of the proletariat and the yoke of capitalism must be overthrown.

I now pass on to the second part of the resolution.

The so-called "revolutionary defencism," which in Russia has permeated all the Narodnik parties (the People's Socialists, Trudoviks, Socialists-Revolutionists), as well as the opportunist party of the Social-Democratic Mensheviks of the Organisation Committee (Chkhheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the unaffiliated revolutionists, represents, by its class character, on the one hand the interests and the standpoint of the wealthier peasants and a part of the small proprietors who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, "revolutionary defencism" is the outcome of the deception by the capitalists of part of the city and village proletarians who by their class position, have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the imperialist war.

This means that it is our task here to indicate what strata of society could give rise to the defencist tendency. Russia is the most petty-bourgeois country in the world, and the upper strata of the petty bourgeoisie are directly interested in prolonging this war. The wealthier peasants, like the capitalists, are profiting by the war. On the other hand, the large mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians has no interest in annexations, because it makes no profit on bank capital. How, then, have these classes come to adopt the standpoint of revolutionary defencism? Such an attitude of these classes toward revolutionary defencism is the outgrowth of bourgeois ideology which the resolution designates by the word "deception." They are unable to differentiate between the interests of the capitalists and the interests of the country. Hence we conclude:

The conference declares that any concession to revolutionary defencism is absolutely not permissible and would actually signify a complete break with internationalism and Socialism. As for the defencist tendencies present among the great masses, our party will struggle against these tendencies by ceaselessly emphasising the truth that any attitude of uncritical confidence in the government of the capitalists at the present moment is one of the greatest obstacles to a speedy conclusion of the war.

The last words express the peculiarity that distinguishes Russia from the other capitalist Western countries, and from all the capi-

that it is the confidence of the ignorant masses that chiefly makes it possible to prolong the war. There the masses are in the iron grip of military discipline. The more discipline, the more democratic is the republic, since power in a republic rests on "the will of the people." Owing to the revolution there is no such discipline in Russia. The masses freely elect representatives to the Soviets—a phenomenon that cannot be seen at the present time anywhere in the world. But they are ignorantly credulous, hence they are being used for the purposes of war. So far we can do nothing but explain. Our explanations must deal with the immediate revolutionary problems and methods of action. As long as the masses are free, any attempt to act in the name of a minority without explaining to the masses may be stamped as senseless Blanquism, as an attempt of adventurers. Only by winning the masses, if they can be won, can we lay a solid foundation for the triumph of the proletarian class struggle.

I now pass to the third part of the resolution:

As for the most important question of the manner of concluding as soon as possible the present capitalist war, not by an oppressive peace, but by a truly democratic peace, the conference recognises and declares the following:

This war cannot be ended by a refusal of the soldiers of one side only to continue the war, by a simple cessation of war activities on the part of one side only.

The idea of thus concluding the war has been attributed to us over and over again by persons who wish to win an easy victory over their opponents by distorting the latter's views,—a usual method of capitalists who ascribe to us the absurd idea of wishing to end the war by a one-sided refusal to fight. They say: "The war cannot be brought to an end by the simple expedient of sticking the bayonet into the ground," to quote one soldier who is a typical revolutionary defencist. I maintain, however, that this is no argument to confute us. The whole idea that the war can be concluded without a change in the ruling classes is an Anarchist idea. Either this idea is Anarchist—in that case it has no significance, no meaning for any state, or it is humanitarian and pacifist and fails to appreciate the connection existing between politics and the oppressing class. War is an evil, peace is a blessing. . . . Certainly this idea must be made clear to the masses, must be popularised. And generally speaking, all our resolutions are being written for the leading elements of the party, for the Marxists; they are not intelligible read-

ing for the masses. But they must serve as unifying and guiding political principles for every propagandist and agitator. To meet this requirement, one more paragraph was added:

The conference reiterates its protests against the base slander circulated by the capitalists against our party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists as robbers no less than the capitalists of Russia, England, France, etc., and Emperor Wilhelm just as much of a crowned bandit as Nicholas II and the monarchs of England, Italy, Rumania, and all the rest.

With regard to this point there was some disagreement among the members of the commission. First, some maintained that at this point our language became too popular; secondly, that the English, Italian, and Rumanian monarchs did not deserve the honour of being mentioned here. After a prolonged discussion, however, we came to the unanimous conclusion that, in view of the fact that our present aim is to refute all the slanders which the *Birzhevka* has attempted to spread against us rather crudely, the *Riech* more subtly, the *Yedinstvo* by transparent innuendoes, we must, on a question of this character, come out with a very sharp and telling criticism of these ideas, having in view the broadest possible masses of the people. When we are asked: why not help overthrow Wilhelm if you consider him a robber, we may answer that the others are also robbers, that we ought to fight against them as well, that one must not forget the kings of Italy and Rumania, who belong to our Allies. These two sentences are intended to combat the slander that is liable to lead to squabbles and pogroms. This is the reason why we must now pass on to the serious question of how to conclude the war.

Our party will explain to the people, with patience and persistence, the truth that wars are carried on by governments, that wars are always indissolubly bound up with the policies of certain classes, that this war may be terminated by a democratic peace only if the entire state power in at least several of the belligerent countries has passed to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians who are really capable of putting an end to the bondage of capitalism.

To a Marxist the statements that wars are carried on by capitalists and that they are bound up with their class interests, are absolute truths. A Marxist does not have to dwell on that. But when skilful agitators and propagandists appear before the masses, they must be able to explain this truth simply, without resorting to foreign words, for with us, in Russia, discussions very often degenerate

into empty and futile quibbling. This we try to achieve in every part of our resolution. We say: in order to understand the war, one must inquire who profits by the war; in order to understand how to put an end to the war, one must find out which classes do not profit by the war. The connection here is perfectly clear, hence we deduce:

In Russia, the revolutionary class, upon having seized the state power, would inaugurate a series of measures to undermine the economic rule of the capitalists, as well as of measures that would render them completely harmless politically, and would immediately and frankly offer to all peoples a democratic peace on the basis of a complete relinquishment of every possible form of annexation or indemnity.

Once we speak in the name of the revolutionary class, the people have the right to ask: well, and what about you, what would you do in their place to end the war? This is an inevitable question. The people are electing us now as their representatives, and we must make a perfectly precise answer. The revolutionary class would set out by undermining the rule of the capitalists, it would then offer to all the peoples precise peace terms, because, unless the rule of the capitalists is undermined, all we can have are scraps of paper. Only a victorious class can accomplish this, can bring about a change in policy.

I repeat once more: in order to reach the uneducated masses, in order to introduce this question to the uninitiated, we need intermediate links in the logical development of our idea. The main fallacy and falsity of popular literature on war lies in the fact that this question is being evaded, it is being passed over in silence, that the matter is represented as if there were no class struggle, as if two countries had lived peacefully, but one attacked the other, and the attacked defended itself. This is a vulgar reasoning in which there is not a shadow of objective truth, it is the way in which educated people deliberately deceive the masses. If approached properly, any representative of the masses would be able to grasp the essential point; for the interests of the ruling classes are one thing, and the interests of the oppressed classes are another.

What would happen, if the revolutionary class seized power?

Such measures, and such an open offer of peace would bring about an attitude of complete confidence of the workers of the belligerent countries towards each other. . . .

Such confidence is impossible now, and wordy manifestos will not create it. A certain thinker once said that language has been given to man to enable him to conceal his thought. The diplomats say: "Conferences are convened to enable us to deceive the people." Not only the capitalists, but the Socialists too reason this way. To be specific, this may be said of the conference called by Borgbjerg.

. . . and would inevitably lead to uprisings of the proletariat against such imperialist governments as might resist the offered peace.

When the capitalist government now says: "We are for peace without annexations"—nobody believes it. The masses of the people have the instinct of oppressed classes which tells them that nothing has changed. Only if the policy were actually changed in one country, confidence would awaken and attempts at uprisings would be made. We speak of "uprisings" because we are now discussing all the countries. "A revolution has taken place in one country, now it must take place in Germany"—this is false reasoning. One is trying to establish a sequence, but this one must not do. All of us went through the revolution of 1905. All of us heard or witnessed how that revolution released a flood of revolutionary ideas throughout the world. Marx often spoke of this influence of revolutions. Still, revolutions cannot be just made, nor is it possible to establish an order of sequence. A revolution cannot be made to order—it grows. What they are now palming off on our people is charlatanism pure and simple. The people are told: Well, you in Russia have made a revolution, now it is the Germans' turn. If the objective conditions change, uprising is inevitable. But as to the order of sequence, as to the precise moment, as to the degree of success, this no one knows. We are asked: If the revolutionary class assumes power in Russia, and if no uprisings break out in the other countries, what will the revolutionary party do? Indeed, what will we do? This question is answered in the last paragraph of our resolution.

Until the revolutionary class in Russia shall have taken over the entire state power, our party will with all means support those proletarian parties and groups in foreign countries as are already, during the continuance of the war, conducting a revolutionary struggle against their own imperialist governments and their own bourgeoisie.

This is all that we can promise and must do now. The revolution is growing in all countries, but when it will break out, and to what

extent, no one knows. In every country there are people who are carrying on a revolutionary struggle against their government. Them and them alone we must support. This is the real thing,—all the rest is a lie. And we add:

Particularly will our party support the mass fraternisation of the soldiers of all the belligerent countries that has already begun at the front. . . .

This is to confute Plekhanov, who argues: "What will be the outcome of all this? Suppose you fraternise, then what? Does not this suggest the possibility of a separate peace at the front?" This is acrobatics, it is not a serious argument. We want fraternisation on all the fronts, and we are taking pains to encourage it. When we worked in Switzerland, we published a proclamation in two languages: in French on one side of the page; in German on the other. We urged those soldiers to do the same thing that we are now urging the Russian soldiers to do. We do not limit ourselves to the fraternisation between the German and the Russian soldiers, we call upon all to fraternise. This, then, is what we mean by fraternisation:

We will thereby endeavour to transform this instinctive expression of solidarity of the oppressed into a class-conscious, well-organised movement for the taking over of all state power in all the belligerent countries by the revolutionary proletariat.

Fraternisation so far is purely instinctive; we must not deceive ourselves on this score. We must admit this, in order not to delude the people. The fraternising soldiers are not actuated by a clear political idea. Rather are they actuated by the instinct of oppressed people, weary, exhausted, and disillusioned in capitalistic promises. They say: "While you keep on talking about peace there,—we have been hearing it now for over two and a half years,—we shall begin concluding it ourselves." This is a true class instinct. Without this instinct the cause of the revolution would be hopeless. For, you know, nobody will free the workers, if they do not free themselves. But is instinct alone sufficient? You would not get very far if you relied on instinct alone. This instinct must be transformed into conscious intelligence.

In our proclamation, "To the Soldiers of All the Belligerent Countries," we answer the question as to what this fraternisation should develop into. We say: "Into the passing of political power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies." Naturally, the

German soldiers will call their Soviets by a different name, but this does not matter. The point is that we admit that so far fraternisation has been purely instinctive, which is an incontrovertible truth, that we do not confine ourselves to encouraging fraternisation, that our objective is to turn this instinctive coming together of workers and peasants of all the countries attired in soldiers' uniforms into a conscious movement, looking toward the passing of state power in all the belligerent countries into the hands of the revolutionary proletariat. This task is difficult, but the position in which humanity finds itself under capitalist rule is monstrously difficult, and leads humanity to ruin. This is why it will call forth that outburst of indignation which is the guarantee of proletarian revolution.

This is our resolution, which we submit to the attention of the conference.

VII

REPORT ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION, MAY 11, 1917

COMRADES: Our party has considered the agrarian question with such thoroughness even during the first revolution, that by this time, I think, our ideas on the subject are pretty well defined. As proof, we have the fact that the section of the conference which is composed of comrades fully versed and deeply interested in this subject has unanimously agreed on the proposed resolution, and has not suggested any substantial corrections. I shall therefore confine myself to a few very brief remarks. And since all the members are in possession of proof sheets of the draft, there is no need for reading it in full.

The present growth of the agrarian movement throughout the whole of Russia is perfectly obvious and undeniable. Our party programme, proposed by the Mensheviks, and adopted by the Stockholm Congress in 1906, had proved inadequate even in the course of the first Russian Revolution. At that Congress the Mensheviks had succeeded in having their programme of municipalisation adopted. In its essence their programme was as follows: The peasant lands, communal as well as private, were to remain the property of the peasants. The lands belonging to the owners of estates were to be taken over by the organs of local self-government. One of the main

reasons advanced by the Mensheviks in favour of such a programme was that the peasants would never understand the transfer of peasant lands to any one but the peasants. A study of the minutes of the Stockholm Congress shows that this argument was particularly stressed by Maslov and Kostrov, who reported on the question. We must not forget—as is often done nowadays—that the congress took place before the first Duma, when there was no definite information about the peasant movement and its strength. Every one knew that Russia was in the midst of an agrarian revolution, but no one knew how that agrarian movement would be organised, nor what slogans would be used in the development of the peasant revolution. There was no way of checking up whether the opinions expressed by the congress were the serious and practical views held by the peasants themselves. This was the reason why the Menshevik arguments carried weight with many delegates. Soon after the Stockholm Congress, we received the first substantial indication how the peasant masses viewed this question. In both the first and the second Dumas, the peasants themselves came out with the “Bill of 104.” I have made a special study of the signatures under this bill, I have familiarised myself in detail with the opinions of the various Deputies, their class affiliations, the extent to which they may be called peasants. And I have stated categorically in my book, which was burned by the Tsar’s censor but which I intend to republish, that of the 104 signatories the overwhelming majority were peasants.¹⁷¹ That bill provided for the nationalisation of the land. The peasants wanted the entire land to become the property of the state.

How, then, can we explain the fact that in both Dumas the Deputies representing the entire Russian peasantry preferred the nationalisation of land to the measures in behalf of the peasantry pressed in both Dumas by the Mensheviks? The Mensheviks proposed that the peasants retain the ownership of their own lands, and that only the lands belonging to the large landowners be transferred to the people; the peasants, on the contrary, maintained that the entire land should be transferred to the people. How can we account for this? The Socialists-Revolutionists say that, owing to the preponderance of the “communal principle” * in the villages, the Russian peasants

* The Narodniks believed that Socialist ideas were inherent in the peasants, and that communal landownership with individual use of the land by the peasant was a manifestation of those ideas.—Ed.

are in sympathy with socialisation, with the labour principle. All this phraseology is absolutely meaningless, it is nothing but words. As a matter of fact the peasants came to the conclusion to which they did because of the fact that all landownership in Russia, whether peasant or landlord, communal or individual, was maintained under antiquated, semi-feudal conditions. And the peasants, considering market conditions, were forced to demand the transfer of the land to all the people. The peasants claim that the tangle of old agrarian life can be untangled only through nationalisation. Their point of view is bourgeois; by equalised use of land they mean the confiscation of the lands of the rich landowners, but not the making of the land possessions of individual owners equal. By nationalisation they mean a redistribution of the land on the basis of the present peasant population. This is really a bourgeois project. None of the peasants mentioned equalisation or socialisation; what they asserted was that it was impossible to wait any longer, that the land had to be redivided,—in other words, they maintained that under twentieth century conditions it was impossible to retain the old forms of agriculture. There were to be no variegated forms of landownership. In this there is not the slightest suggestion of socialisation. A brief summary of the statistics relating to land possessions in 1905 shows that on the average 300 peasant families held as much land (2,000 desiatinas) as one landlord family. That is the reason why the peasant demand is called a demand for equalisation. In this sense it is, of course, equalisation, but from this it does not at all follow that the peasant wants to equalise all small households. The bill of the 104 reveals the opposite.

It is necessary to state these ideas, for they offer a scientific basis for our opinion that, from the bourgeois-democratic standpoint, the nationalisation of land is indispensable. But nationalisation is also necessary for another reason,—it deals an overwhelming blow to the institution of private ownership of the means of production. To imagine that upon the abolition of private property in land everything in Russia will remain as of old, is simply absurd.

In addition, the draft resolution contains some practical conclusions and demands. Of the minor corrections I shall call attention to the following:

The first point in the resolution reads: "The party of the proletariat supports wholeheartedly the immediate and complete confiscation of all the land owned by the landowners. . . ." Instead of

"supports" we ought to say "fights for." . . . Our point of view is not that the peasants have not enough land and that they need more. This is the current opinion. We say that private landownership is the basis of the oppression that crushes the peasantry and retards its development. The question is not whether the peasants have or have not enough land. Down with feudal oppression!—this is how the matter should be put from the standpoint of the revolutionary class struggle, and not from the standpoint of those bureaucrats who keep on arguing as to how much land the peasants have and as to how to distribute it. The order of points two and three should, in my opinion, be reversed, because to us revolutionary initiative is more important than an abstract law; the law must be the result of such initiative. If you wait until the law is written, and do not in the meanwhile take revolutionary action, you will have neither the law nor the land.

People often object to nationalisation by saying that it presupposes a gigantic bureaucratic apparatus. This is true, but state landownership implies that every peasant is leasing the land from the state, and that the transfer of leaseholds is prohibited. The question therefore as to how much and what kind of land the peasant shall hold is to be entirely settled by the proper democratic, not bureaucratic, organ of authority.

For "farm hands" we substitute "agricultural workers." Several comrades maintained that the word "farm hand" was offensive; objections were raised to this word. It should be removed.

It is useless to speak now of proletarian-peasant committees or councils in connection with the settlement of the land question, for, as we see, the peasants have already created Soviets of Soldiers' Deputies, and have thus effected a division between the proletariat and the peasantry.

Everybody knows that the petty-bourgeois defencist parties want the settlement of the land question postponed until the Constituent Assembly meets. We demand the immediate transfer of all lands to the peasants in a highly organised manner. We are absolutely against anarchistic seizures. You propose that the peasants enter into agreements with the landowners. We say that the land should be taken over right now. The lands must be cultivated immediately if we wish to avert hunger, to save the country from the collapse which is drawing nearer with terrific rapidity. One cannot now accept the prescriptions offered by Shingarev and the Cadets who

suggest that we wait for the Constituent Assembly which is to convene on a date as yet unknown, nor can we now enter into agreements as to land tenure with the landowners. The peasants are already seizing the land without paying for it, or paying only one-fourth of the former rental.

One comrade has brought a local resolution from the province of Penza. The resolution says that the peasants are seizing the landowners' agricultural implements, which however they do not divide among the individual peasants, but turn into communal property. They establish a definite order, a rule, in which these implements are to be used by the various peasants in the cultivation of their land. In resorting to such measures, they are chiefly interested in increasing agricultural production. This fact is of tremendous constructive significance, despite the landowners and the capitalists who shout that this is anarchy. But if they keep on talking and shouting about this as anarchy, and if the peasants in the meantime sit back and wait, then you will indeed have anarchy. The peasants have proved that they understand economic conditions and social control much better than do the government officials, and that they apply such control a hundred times more efficiently. Such an undertaking, easily realisable in a small village, inevitably leads to more sweeping measures. When the peasant comes to learn this,—and he has already begun to learn it,—the knowledge of bourgeois professors will not be needed; he will himself conclude that it is essential that the agricultural implements be utilised not only in the cultivation of pieces of land but in the cultivation of the entire land. What methods the peasants pursue in accomplishing this, are not important. We do not know whether they combine their individual fields for communal tilling and sowing or not, and it does not matter, if each community follows its own methods. What does matter is that the peasants are fortunate in not having with them a large number of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who style themselves Marxists, Social-Democrats, and with a grave mien teach the people that the time is not yet ripe for a Socialist revolution and that therefore the peasants must not take the land. Fortunately there are few such gentlemen in the Russian villages. If the peasants contented themselves merely with taking the land on the basis of agreements with the landowners, and failed to apply their own methods collectively, failure would be inevitable, and the peasant committees would become mere toys, a game without odds.

This is the reason why we propose to add point eight to the resolution.

Once we know that the local peasants have themselves taken the initiative, it is our duty to declare that we support and recommend their action. Only in such action do we find the assurance that the revolution will not be limited to measures of a formal character, that the struggle against the crisis will not remain a mere subject for departmental discussion and Shingarev's epistles, but that the peasants will actually go forth in an organised way to fight famine and to work for greater production.

VIII

REPLY TO N. S. ANGARSKY DURING THE DEBATE ON THE AGRARIAN QUESTION, MAY 11, 1917¹⁷²

COMRADES: I think that Comrade Angarsky is guilty of a number of contradictions. I have been speaking of the material basis for the aspiration toward nationalisation. The peasants have no conception of the meaning of nationalisation. I have said that there are certain conditions prevailing on the all-Russian and world markets, and that those conditions are responsible for the high prices of grain. Every peasant sees, knows and feels these fluctuations of prices, and agriculture must be conducted in harmony with those conditions. I claim that our system of landholding is antiquated, that there is a discrepancy between the old and the new methods of agriculture, and that this discrepancy has impelled the peasant to strive for a change. The peasant is a private owner, asserts Comrade Angarsky. He is perfectly right. It is on the basis of this fact that Stolypin wanted to change the old system of agricultural relations; he did everything possible to bring that about, and still he failed, because it is impossible to change these relations without revolutionary changes. This is the material basis for the peasant's aspiration toward the nationalisation of land, though the peasant is absolutely ignorant as to the real meaning of nationalisation. The peasant who holds to private ownership has an instinctive tendency to maintain that the land belongs to God. The reason is that it has become impossible to continue under the old forms of landownership. What Comrade Angarsky proposes is the result of gross misunderstanding. The second paragraph of our resolution states that peasant landownership, from top to bottom

and all along the line, is entangled in a maze of antiquated semi-feudal relations. But does that paragraph make any reference to the estates of the great landowners? No. Comrade Angarsky's amendment is based on a misapprehension. He attributed to me things I never said, things of which the peasants have not the slightest conception. The peasants know the world situation by the price of grain and of other staple commodities. If a railroad passes through his village, the peasant learns these things in connection with his own household. It has become impossible to live in the old way. This the peasant feels, and he expresses this feeling in his radical demand for the overthrow of the entire old system of land-ownership. The peasant wants to be a proprietor, but he wants to be one on land newly divided; he wants to conduct his economic enterprise on land the ownership of which is determined by his present needs, and not by the needs prescribed for him by various bureaucrats. The peasant knows it perfectly well, but of course he expresses it differently, and this is the material basis for the peasant's aspiration toward the nationalisation of the land.

IX

REPORT ON THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME, MAY 11, 1917 ¹⁷³

COMRADES: The situation with regard to the revision of the party programme is this: The first draft of proposed changes in the theoretical part of our programme and in a number of basic points in its political part was submitted to the commission. The whole programme must be revised, its complete obsolescence having been pointed out in party circles long before the war. It has turned out, however, that there is not the slightest hope for discussing the proposed change of the programme as a whole. On the other hand, the committee has come to the unanimous conclusion that a revision of the programme is imperative, and that in a great number of questions it is possible and necessary to indicate the direction along which such revision should be made. We have therefore agreed on the following draft of a resolution which I am going to read to you now, making brief comments as I go along. We decline at the present time to put forth precisely formulated theses; we simply indicate the direction which any revision should follow.

(Reads the resolution.)

The conference recognises as imperative the revision of the party programme along the following lines:

1. Evaluating imperialism and the epoch of imperialist wars in connection with the approaching Socialist revolution: struggle with the distortion of Marxism by the so-called defencists who have forgotten Marx's slogan—"the workers have no fatherland."

This is so clear that no explanation is needed. Indeed the policy of our party has advanced considerably and has practically taken the stand suggested in the above formulation.

2. Amending the theses and paragraphs dealing with the state; such amendment to be in the nature of a demand for a democratic proletarian-peasant republic (*i.e.*, a type of state functioning without police, without a standing army, and without a privileged bureaucracy), and not for a bourgeois-parliamentary republic.

Other formulations of this point had been proposed. One of them referred to the experience of the Paris Commune and to the experience of the period between the seventies and the eighties of the last century, but such a formulation is unsatisfactory and too general; another referred to a republic of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; this formulation, too, proved unsatisfactory to a majority of the comrades. A formulation, however, is needed, because what matters is not the name of an institution, but its political character and structure. By saying "proletarian-peasant republic," we indicate its social content and political character.

3. Eliminating or amending the obsolete portions of the political programme.

Our general political work within the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies has practically gone in this direction; there is no doubt, therefore, that the change in this particular point of the programme and the precise formulation of our estimate of the moment in which the revolution found our party, is not likely to provoke any disagreements.

4. Recasting a number of points in the political minimum programme, so as to point out with greater precision more consistent democratic demands.

5. Completely recasting in very many places the out-of-date economic portions of the minimum programme and points relating to popular education.

The main thing here is that these points have grown out of date; the trade union movement has outstripped them.

6. Recasting the agrarian programme in conformity with the adopted resolution on the agrarian question.

7. Inserting a demand for the nationalisation of a number of syndicates already ripe for such a step.

This point has been formulated rather cautiously, so as to allow for a narrowing or a widening of the demand, depending upon the drafts that will be printed.

8. Adding a characterisation of the main currents in contemporary Socialism.

The Communist Manifesto contains such an addition.

The Conference directs the Central Committee to work out, on the basis of the above suggestions, a draft for a party programme. This is to be carried out within two months, and the draft to be submitted for ratification to the party congress. The Conference calls upon all organisations and all members of the party to consider drafts of the programme, to correct them, and to work out counter-proposals.

It has been pointed out that it would be desirable to create a scientific organ and develop a literature dealing with this subject, but for this we have neither the men nor the means. This is the resolution that will hasten the revision of our programme. This resolution will be forwarded abroad to enable our comrades-internationalists to take part in the revision of the programme undertaken by our party on the basis of the experience of the world war.

X

SPEECH ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION, MAY 12, 1917 ¹⁷⁴

EVER since 1903, when our party adopted its programme, we have been encountering the desperate opposition of the Poles. A study of the minutes of the second congress reveals that even then the Poles were advancing the same argument that they are advancing now, and that the Polish Social-Democrats had left the congress because our recognition of the right of nations to self-determination was unacceptable to them. And we have been confronted with this question ever since. Though imperialism was already in existence in 1903, there was no mention made of it in the many arguments then advanced. And the position of the Polish Social-Democracy is as strange and monstrous an error now as it was then. These people wish to reduce the stand of our party to that of the chauvinists.

The policy of Poland is thoroughly nationalistic owing to Russia's age-long oppression of Poland, and the entire Polish people is permeated with one idea—revenge upon the Muscovites. No one has oppressed the Poles as much as have the Russian people. The Russian people have served in the hands of the Tsars as the executioner of Polish freedom. No one hates Russia so intensely as do the Poles, and this has resulted in a peculiar situation. On account of the Polish bourgeoisie, Poland has become an obstacle in the path of the Socialist movement. Let the world go hang, as long as Poland is free. Of course, to put the question in this light means to make a farce of internationalism. Of course, Poland is now a subject nation, but for the Polish nationalists to count on Russia to effect Poland's liberation is treason to internationalism. Still, the Polish nationalists have so imbued the Polish people with their spirit that this view prevails.

The great historical service rendered by our comrades, the Polish Social-Democrats, consists in their advancing the slogan of internationalism, in their maintaining that brotherly union of the proletariat of all countries was of supreme importance to them and that they would refuse to go to war for the liberation of Poland. This is their great service, and this is why we have always regarded as Socialists only those Social-Democrats in Poland. The others are social-patriots, Polish Plekhanovs. But this unique situation, where people, to safeguard Socialism, were forced to struggle against a rabid, morbid nationalism, has been productive of a strange phenomenon: The Polish comrades come and tell us that we must renounce the freedom of Poland, its right of separation.

Why should we, Great-Russians, who have been oppressing a greater number of nations than any other people, why should we repudiate the right of separation for Poland, the Ukraine, Finland? We are asked to become chauvinists, because by doing that we would render the position of Social-Democrats in Poland less difficult. We make no pretence at seeking to liberate Poland, because the Polish people dwell between two states capable of fighting. But instead of teaching the Polish workers that chauvinists have no place in the Socialist Party and that only those Social-Democrats are real democrats who maintain that the Polish people ought to be free, the Polish Social-Democrats argue that just because they find the union with the Russian workers advantageous they are opposed to Poland's separation. They have a perfect right to do so. But these people

fail to understand that to enhance internationalism it is not at all necessary to reiterate the same words. In Russia we must stress the right of separation for the subject nations, while in Poland we must stress the right of such nations to unite. The right to unite implies the right to separate. We Russians must emphasise the right to separate, while the Poles must emphasise the right to unite.

We notice here a number of sophisms leading to a complete renunciation of Marxism. Comrade Piatakov's standpoint is a repetition of Rosa Luxemburg's standpoint. . . . * (Holland is an example.) This is how Comrade Piatakov reasons, and this is also how he confutes himself. Theoretically he is against the right of separation, but to the people he declares that one who is against the right of separation is no Socialist. What Comrade Piatakov says is incredible confusion. In Western Europe most of the countries have settled their national questions long ago. When one says that the national question has been settled, one speaks of Western Europe. Comrade Piatakov applies this where it does not belong, to Eastern Europe, and we find ourselves in a ridiculous position.

Think of the terrible mess that results! Finland is right at our side. Comrade Piatakov supplies no definite answer as to Finland; he is in utter confusion. In yesterday's *Rabochaia Gazeta* we have read that separatism is growing in Finland. Finns arriving here inform us that separatism is developing in their country, because the Cadets have refused to grant it complete autonomy. There a crisis is approaching; dissatisfaction with Governor-General Rodichev is rife, but here the *Rabochaia Gazeta* insists that the Finns ought to wait for the Constituent Assembly, that then an agreement will be effected between Finland and Russia. What is an agreement? The Finns must maintain that they are entitled to determine their own destiny in their own way, and any Great-Russian who denies this right is a chauvinist. It would be another thing entirely if we said to the Finnish worker: Decide as is most advantageous to you. . . . *

Comrade Piatakov simply rejects our slogan, when he says that this is no slogan for a Socialist revolution. He himself, however, has not offered any other slogan. The method of accomplishing a Socialist revolution under the slogan: "Down with the boundaries" is an utter absurdity. We have not succeeded in publishing the article in which I branded this view as "imperialist economism."¹⁷⁵

* An omission in the minutes.—*Ed.*

What does "the method" of a Socialist revolution under the slogan "Down with the boundaries" mean? We maintain that the state is necessary, and the existence of a state presupposes boundaries. The state may of course be ruled by a bourgeois government, while we need the Soviets. But even the Soviets are confronted with the question of boundaries. What does it mean, "Down with the boundaries"? This is the beginning of anarchy. . . . The "method" of a Socialist revolution under the slogan "Down with the boundaries" is a hodgepodge. When the time is ripe for a Socialist revolution, when the revolution finally occurs, it will sweep across boundaries. We shall help it along, but how, we do not yet know. "The method of a Socialist revolution" is a mere phrase, devoid of meaning. In so far as the bourgeois revolution has left some problems unsolved, we shall solve them. As regards the separatist movement, we are neutral, indifferent. If Finland, if Poland, if the Ukraine break away from Russia, it is nothing terrible. Wherein is it bad? One who says so, is a chauvinist. One must be insane to continue the policy of Tsar Nicholas. Norway has separated from Sweden. . . . Once upon a time Alexander I and Napoleon traded peoples, once upon a time the Tsars were trading portions of Poland. Are we to continue this policy of the Tsars? This is repudiation of internationalist tactics, this is chauvinism of the worst brand. Suppose Finland does separate, why is it so bad? In both peoples among the proletariat of Norway and Sweden mutual confidence increased after separation. The Swedish landowners wanted to wage war, but the Swedish workers refused to be drawn into such a war.

All the Finns want now is autonomy. We stand for the complete freedom of Finland. Only when this ideal is realised, will faith in Russian democracy be strengthened, will the Finns refuse to separate. While Mr. Rodichev goes to Finland to haggle over autonomy, our Finnish comrades come here and maintain that they need autonomy. But they are met with a volley of cannon-shots and are told: "Wait for the Constituent Assembly." We, however, say: "Any Russian Socialist who denies freedom to Finland is a chauvinist."

We say that boundaries are determined by the will of the population. Russia, you must not dare fight over Courland! Germany, out with your armies from Courland! This is our solution of the separation problem. The proletariat must not resort to force, for it must not interfere with the freedom of peoples. Only then will

the slogan "Down with the boundaries" be a true slogan, when the Socialist revolution has become a reality, and not a method. Then we shall say: Comrades, come unto us. . . .

Now war is an entirely different matter. When necessary, we shall not refuse to wage a revolutionary war. We are no pacifists. . . . But while we have Miliukov enthroned, and while he sends Rodichev to Finland, where he haggles shamefully with the Finnish people, we say to the Russian people: Don't you dare rape Finland; no people can be free which oppresses another people. In our resolution concerning Borgbjerg we state: Withdraw your armies, and let the nation settle this question by itself. But if the Soviet seizes power to-morrow, that will no longer constitute a "method of a Socialist revolution," we shall then say: Germany, out with your armies from Poland; Russia, out with your armies from Armenia,—otherwise, the whole thing will be a lie.

Regarding his oppressed Poland, Comrade Dzierzynski tells us that everybody is a chauvinist there. But why does not any Pole tell us what we should do with Finland, what we should do with the Ukraine? We have been arguing this question ever since 1903; it is becoming difficult to dwell on it. Go whither you please. . . . He who does not accept this point of view is an annexationist, a chauvinist. We are for a fraternal union of all nations. If there is a Ukrainian republic and a Russian republic, there will be closer contact, greater confidence between the two. If the Ukrainians see that we have a Soviet republic, they will not break away. But if we retain the Miliukov republic, they will break away. When Comrade Piatakov, contradicting his own views, said that he is against the forcible retention of nations within the boundaries of Russia, he really recognised the principle of self-determination. We do not at all want the peasant in Khiva to live under the Khan of Khiva. By developing our revolution we shall influence the oppressed masses. Propaganda within the oppressed masses can be carried on only in this manner.

But any Russian Socialist who does not recognise the freedom of Finland and the Ukraine, is bound to degenerate into a chauvinist. And no sophisms, no references to a special "method" will help him justify himself.

XI

SPEECH ON THE SITUATION WITHIN THE INTERNATIONAL AND THE
TASKS OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR
PARTY, MAY 12, 1917¹⁷⁶

COMRADE ZINOVIEV himself recognised that our visit to Stockholm would be the last one, and that our presence there would be purely for informational purposes.¹⁷⁷

When Grimm invited us to a conference, I refused to go, for I realised that it would be useless to talk to people who stood for social-chauvinism. We say: "No participation with social-chauvinists." We come and address ourselves to any Zimmerwald section. Grimm had a moral and a formal right to write to-day's resolution. His right is based on Kautsky in Germany, on Longuet in France. This is how the matter stands officially: Grimm has announced that "we will disband our bureau, as soon as Huysmans organises a bureau." When we said that such a solution was not acceptable to Zimmerwald, he agreed, but declared that "that was the opinion of the majority,"—and he told the truth.

As to our visit. "We shall get information, we shall get in touch with the Left Zimmerwald group," it is claimed. There is very little hope that we shall attract other elements. There is no use in creating illusions for ourselves; first, the visit will not take place; secondly, if it does, it will be our last one; thirdly, we cannot, because of technical obstacles, attract those elements that wish to break with the social-chauvinists. But let Comrade Nogin make the first and Comrade Zinoviev the last visit to Stockholm. As for me, I express the very legitimate wish that this "last visit" experiment may be performed as quickly and successfully as possible.

XII

SPEECH IN FAVOUR OF THE RESOLUTION ON THE
POLITICAL SITUATION, MAY 12, 1917

IN the resolution on the political situation, it would be wrong to speak only of Russian conditions. The war has bound us so indissolubly that we would be guilty of a grave error, if we ignored the whole of international relations.

The main subject treated in this resolution is the tasks with which

the Russian proletariat may be confronted in case the world movement brings it face to face with a social revolution.

The objective conditions for a Socialist revolution that undoubtedly existed even before the war in the more developed and advanced countries, have been and are ripening with tremendous rapidity as a result of the war. The crowding out and ruin of small and medium-sized economic enterprises is proceeding at an accelerating pace. The concentration and internationalisation of capital is making gigantic strides. Monopoly capitalism is changing into state monopoly capitalism. Social regulation of production and distribution is, under the pressure of circumstances, being introduced in many countries. Some are introducing universal labour service.

Present economic conditions have caused the disappearance of planless capitalism. Up to the war there were monopolies, trusts, syndicates; since the war we have had state monopoly. Universal labour service is something new, something that constitutes part of a Socialist whole,—this is often overlooked by those who fear to face present conditions frankly.

The central point of the first part of the resolution is an analysis of conditions of capitalist economy throughout the world. It is noteworthy that twenty-seven years ago Engels pointed out that to characterise capitalism as something distinguished by its planlessness, means to overlook the rôle played by trusts, and is unsatisfactory. Engels' criticism was that "when we come to the trust, then planlessness disappears," though there is capitalism. This remark of Engels is particularly appropriate now, when we have a military state, when we have state-monopoly capitalism. The introduction of planning into industry keeps the workers enslaved none the less, though it enables the capitalists to gather in their profits in a more planful way. We now witness the metamorphosis of capitalism into a higher, a regulated form of capitalism.

The second part of the resolution requires no explanations.

The third part requires more detailed comment.

The proletariat of Russia, operating in one of the most backward countries in Europe, surrounded by a vast petty-peasant population, cannot make its aim the immediate realisation of a Socialist transformation.

Yet it would be a grave error to infer from the foregoing that the proletariat must support the bourgeoisie, or that we must keep our activities within the boundaries acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that the proletariat must renounce its leading rôle in the matter of explaining to the people the imperative urgency of a number of measures that are ripe to be put into practice and that lead to Socialism. Such inference would be in practice equivalent to going over to the side of the bourgeoisie.

From the first premise it is customary to make the following

conclusion: "Russia is a backward country, a peasant, a petty-bourgeois country, and that is why it is futile to speak of a social revolution there." One forgets, however, that the war has placed us in extraordinary circumstances, and that alongside of the petty bourgeoisie we have large-scale capital. But what should the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies do when it gets into power? Should it turn to the side of the bourgeoisie? Our answer is that the working class will continue the class struggle.

What is possible and what is imperative with the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in power?

First of all, the nationalisation of the land. The nationalisation of the land is a bourgeois measure, it does not exclude capitalism, nor does capitalism exclude it. Nationalisation, however, is bound to deal a heavy blow to the petty proprietors. Further:

. . . establishment of government control over all the banks which are to be united into a single central bank, also control over insurance companies and the larger capitalist syndicates (for example, the sugar syndicate, the coal syndicate, the metal syndicate, etc.), all this to be accompanied by a change to a more just and progressive taxation of incomes and property. Economic conditions are ripe for such measures. From the technical point of view they can be carried out immediately. From the political point of view they are likely to get the support of the overwhelming majority of peasants, who in every respect will gain by such reforms.

This point provoked discussion. I already had occasion to speak of this in the *Pravda* in connection with Plekhanov's articles. "When they talk of the impossibility of Socialism," I wrote, "they try to speak of the latter in a way most advantageous to themselves, they represent it vaguely, indefinitely, as some sort of a jump." Kautsky himself wrote: "No Socialist speaks of the abolition of private property in the case of the peasants." But does that mean that existing large-scale capital must make it unnecessary for the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to control production, to control the sugar-manufacturers' syndicates, etc.? This measure is not Socialism,—it is a transitional measure, but the carrying out of such measures together with the existence of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies will bring about a situation where Russia stands with one foot in Socialism,—we say with one foot because the peasant majority is in control of the other economic part of the country. It cannot be denied that economically we are ripe for a change. To carry out this change politically, we must get the majority, and the majority consists of peasants who are naturally

interested in such changes. Whether they will prove sufficiently organised is another matter; we are not responsible for them.

An old and oft-repeated objection to Socialism is that Socialism means "barracks for the masses," "bureaucratic rigidity in ruling the masses." The question of Socialism should be viewed now in a different and new light. We must take it out of the realm of the nebulous and place it in the realm of practical measures: nationalisation of land, control over syndicates, etc.

All the measures just indicated, as well as others of the same nature, could and should be not merely discussed and prepared so that they might be carried out on a national scale in case the proletarians and semi-proletarians gained power, but, whenever opportunity presents itself, should be carried into life immediately by local revolutionary organs of people's power.

In carrying out the above measures, it is necessary to exercise extreme circumspection and caution, and to win a solid majority of the population as well as its intelligent conviction that the country is ready for the practical introduction of this or that measure, but it is in this direction that we must rivet the attention and the efforts of the class-conscious vanguard of the proletarian masses, who are in duty bound to help the peasant masses find an escape from the present economic chaos.

"This is a bourgeois revolution, it is therefore useless to speak of Socialism," say our opponents. But we say just the reverse: "Since the bourgeoisie cannot find a way out of the present situation, the revolution is bound to go on." We must not confine ourselves to democratic phrases, we must make the situation clear to the masses, we must indicate to them a series of practical measures: They must take over the syndicates and must control them through the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, etc. When all such measures are carried out, Russia will stand with one foot in Socialism. Our economic programme must indicate a way to escape economic chaos,—this is what should guide our actions.

XIII

CONCLUDING REMARKS AT THE CLOSING OF THE CONFERENCE, MAY 12, 1917

DUE to lack of time Lenin declined to speak in favour of changing the name of the party. He referred, however, to his newly written pamphlet—*The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our Revolution*, * which will serve as material for discussion in the local party organisations.

A few words about the conference.

There was little time and much work. The conditions in which

* See pp. 130–157 of this book.—Ed.

our party finds itself are difficult. The defencist party is large, but the proletarian masses look with disfavour upon defencism and the imperialist war. Our resolutions are not adapted to the understanding of the large masses; they will serve, however, to unify the activity of our agitators and propagandists; the readers will find in them guidance for their activities. We have to talk to millions, we must draw additional forces from the masses, we must take hold of the more educated and class-conscious workers who could explain our theses in a way intelligible to the masses. We have made an effort to give in our brochures a more popular presentation of our resolutions, and we hope that our comrades will do the same thing locally. The proletariat will find in our resolutions material to guide it in its movement toward the second stage of our revolution.

PREFACE TO *IMPERIALISM AS THE FINAL STAGE OF CAPITALISM*¹⁷⁸

THE pamphlet that I am herewith presenting to the attention of the reader was written in Zürich in the spring of 1916. Owing to the conditions under which I had to work there, I was naturally handicapped, to a certain extent, by the lack of French and English books and, to a very great extent, by the lack of Russian books. However, the most important English work on imperialism, the book of J. A. Hobson, I had studied with all the attention which I think that work deserves.¹⁷⁹

This pamphlet was written with the Tsar's censor in mind. That was the reason why I had to confine myself to a strictly theoretical, mostly economic, analysis. As for the few indispensable political remarks, they had to be formulated with the greatest caution, with subtleties and in the accursed *Æsopian* language which tsarism had forced upon all revolutionists who undertook to write "legal" works.

Now that Russia is free, it is painful to reread those places in the pamphlet which have been distorted, mangled, and cramped by the ever-present thought of the Tsar's censor. That imperialism is on the eve of a rapidly approaching Socialist revolution, that social-chauvinism (Socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds), is an out-and-out betrayal of Socialism, is a complete desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie, that this schism in the labour movement is closely connected with the objective conditions of imperialism, etc.—all this I was forced to express in "slave" language. The reader interested in this question I must direct to the articles which I wrote abroad in 1914-1917,¹⁸⁰ which are soon to appear in a new edition.* I call especial attention to one place on pages 119 and 120.** Here, in order to explain to the reader in a "legal" form the shameful lies of the capitalists and the social-chauvinists who have deserted to their side (and whom Kautsky fights so inconsistently) with re-

* These writings covering the period of the World War will be published as Volumes XVIII and XIX of the *Collected Works*.—Ed.

** First Russian edition of *Imperialism as the Final Stage of Capitalism*, 1917.—Ed.

gard to annexations, in order to expose the manner in which the latter try to condone the annexationist policies of *their* capitalists, I was forced to resort to . . . Japan as an illustration. Where I say Japan, the careful reader will easily substitute Russia, and where I say Korea, he will read Finland, Poland, Courland, Ukraine, Khiva, Bokhara, Estonia, and other regions inhabited by people other than Great-Russians.

I hope that my pamphlet will help to clarify a fundamental economic question without the study of which there can be no intelligent estimate of contemporary war and contemporary politics—the question of the economic essence of imperialism.

Written May 9, 1917.

Printed in 1917 in *Imperialism as the Final Stage of Capitalism*. Published by the firm "Zhizn i Znanie."

MATERIALS RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME

First published in the pamphlet *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme* by the firm "Priboi," June, 1917.

Российская Социалъ-Демократическая Рабочая Партия.

*Пролетаріи всіхъ странъ,
соединяйтесь!*

Матеріалы по пересмотру партийной программы,

ПОДЪ РЕДАКЦІЕЙ И СЪ ПРЕДИСЛОВІЕМЪ
Н. Ленина

Цѣна 25 коп.



ПЕТРОГРАДЪ.

1917.

Title Page of the Pamphlet, *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme*, Petrograd, 1917 (see p. 325).

MATERIALS RELATING TO THE REVISION OF THE PARTY PROGRAMME¹⁸¹

I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PAMPHLET, *Materials Relating to the Revision of the Party Programme*

THE Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party ("Bolsheviks") has instructed the undersigned to publish immediately all the material at the disposal of the Central Committee relating to the revision of the party programme.

This material consists of the following:

A. The first draft of changes to be made in the theoretical and political parts of the programme submitted by the writer of these lines to the All-Russian Conference of the R.S.-D.L.P. (May 7-12, 1917) and considered only by a committee formed at the conference for the purpose of working out this problem.

B. Remarks regarding the draft, or in connection with it, made by the committee or its individual members.

C. My reply to those remarks.

D. A complete draft of changes to be made in the economic parts of the minimum programme worked out during the conference (May 7-12, 1917) by its sub-committee on the protection of labour.

E. A draft, accompanied by brief explanatory notes, of changes to be made in those parts of the party programme which deal with popular education. This draft was worked out by N. K. Krupskaia after the conference.

Since the chief task of the party at present is to attract through the publication of this material the greatest possible number of comrades into active participation in the preparation of a party programme, I am publishing this material together with a number of brief explanatory notes.

Put together, the above list of proposed changes in the programme forms the draft of a complete text of a new programme. I therefore place at the end of this pamphlet both the old and the new texts of the programme, but so arranged as to enable the reader to

see the whole material at a glance, and make it easier for him to compare the texts and to insert his own corrections.

In accordance with the instructions of the Central Committee, I urge all comrades, members of the party, as well as sympathisers, to reprint this material in as many party publications as possible, to introduce it to each and every member of our party, and to address to the office of the *Pravda* (Moika, 32, Petrograd, attention of Central Committee, Material Relating to Programme Revision) all possible suggestions and drafts.

May 20, 1917.

II

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE THEORETICAL, POLITICAL AND SEVERAL OTHER PARTS OF THE PROGRAMME

AT the end of that part of the programme which deals with general principles (following the words "upon the point of view of the proletariat") insert:

At the present time, approximately since the beginning of the twentieth century, world capitalism has reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, represents such a highly developed capitalist economy when monopolist combines of capitalists—syndicates, cartels, trusts—have assumed decisive importance, enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital, the export of capital into foreign countries has grown to colossal dimensions, the whole globe has been territorially partitioned among the richest countries, and the economic partitioning of the world among international trusts has begun.

Imperialist wars, i. e., wars for world domination, for markets where banking capital can be utilised, for the stifling of small and weak peoples, are inevitable in such a state of affairs. And it is precisely this that characterises the first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-1917.

The exceedingly high stage of development attained by world capitalism in general; the displacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism; the preparation, owing to the development of banks and capitalist combines, of an apparatus for social regulation of the process of production and distribution of goods; the

rising cost of living resulting from the growth of capitalist monopolies, and the increasing pressure exerted by such syndicates over the working class; the horrors and suffering, the ruin and madness bred by the imperialist war—all these put together make the present stage in capitalist development an era of proletarian and Socialist revolution.

This era has begun.

Only a proletarian, Socialist revolution is able to lead humanity out of the blind alley created by imperialism and imperialist wars. Whatever difficulties, possible temporary reverses, and waves of counter-revolution the revolution may encounter, the final victory of the proletariat is certain.

In view of the objective conditions, the first thing to do now is to prepare the proletariat, immediately and on all points, for the conquering of political power, in order to be able to bring into life political and economic changes that form the content of a Socialist revolution.

The fulfillment of this task requires the fullest trust, the closest fraternal ties, the completest unity of revolutionary action of the entire working class in all the advanced countries; the task cannot be carried out without an immediate break, in principle, from the bourgeois perversion of Socialism which has gained the upper hand among the leadership of an overwhelming majority of the official Social-Democratic parties. Such a perversion is, on the one hand, the tendency toward social-chauvinism, Socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds, the use of the slogan "national defence" for the purpose of protecting the predatory interests of their own national bourgeoisie; on the other hand, the equally wide and international movement of the so-called "centre" which stands for unity with the social-chauvinists and for the preservation or rectification of the bankrupt Second International,—a movement oscillating between social-chauvinism and the revolutionary international struggle of the proletariat for the realisation of a Socialist order.

In the minimum programme the whole beginning (from the words "on the road" up to paragraph 1) should be eliminated, and replaced by the following:

At the present moment in Russia, when the Provisional Government, which is part and parcel of the capitalist class and enjoys the

confidence—not absolutely, to be sure—of the vast masses of the petty-bourgeois population, has undertaken to convene a Constituent Assembly,—the party of the proletariat is confronted with the immediate task of striving for a system of state organisation which would best secure economic progress and the rights of the people as a whole, and also make the transition into Socialism as painless as possible.

The party of the proletariat cannot confine itself to a bourgeois-parliamentary democratic republic, which throughout the world maintains and strives to perpetuate monarchist means for oppressing the masses, namely, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy.

The party fights for a more democratic workers' and peasants' republic, wherein the police and the standing army would be completely eliminated and replaced by a general arming of the people, by a universal militia; all the officers would be not only elective, but also subject to instant recall by a majority of electors; all officers, without exception, would be paid at the rate of the average wage of a skilled worker; all representative parliamentary institutions would gradually give place to Soviets of the people's representatives (from various classes and professions, or from various localities), functioning both as legislative and executive bodies.

The constitution of the democratic republic of Russia must ensure:

§ 1. The sovereignty of the people; the whole power of the state must be in the hands of the people's representatives,—elected by the people and subject to instant recall—who are to constitute one popular assembly, one chamber.

§ 2. Add:

Proportional representation at all elections; recall, without exception, of all delegates and elected officers, at any time, by the will of the majority of their electors.

§ 3. Add:

Abolition of all state-appointed local and district officers.*

In § 8. Express the last sentence thus:

Introduction of the use of the native language in all local, public and state institutions; the obligatory state language to be abolished.

§ 9. Change to read:

* See in *Pravda*, No. 68, June 10, 1917, F. Engels' discussion of the Marxist and consistently democratic view on the matter of appointing and approving of officers elected by the local population. [See Book II of this volume for Lenin's article reprinted from the *Pravda* of June 10, 1917.—Ed.]

The right of all nationalities which are now parts of the Russian state freely to separate and to form independent states. The republic of the Russian people should draw to itself other peoples or nationalities not through violence, but through voluntary and mutual agreement to build a common state. The common aims and brotherly union of the workers of all countries are incompatible with either direct or indirect violence practiced upon other nationalities.

§ 11. Change to read:

Election by the people of judges and other officers, in civil service as well as in the army, and recall of any of them, at any time, by the will of the majority of their electors.

§ 12. Change to read:

Replacement of the police and the standing army by a general arming of the people; workers and employees to receive their regular wages from the capitalists for the time given to public service in the people's militia.

After the fiscal section of the programme (after the words "on incomes and inheritances") insert:

On the one hand, the great development of capitalism in the banking business and in the trustified branches of industry, and on the other hand, the economic chaos brought on by the imperialist war and the consequent omnipresent demand for state and public control over the production and distribution of the most important products, impel the party to demand the nationalisation of banks, syndicates (trusts), etc.

The agrarian programme to be formulated thus:

Retain the beginning (from the words "in order to avoid remnants" to the words "the party demands"); the subsequent parts change as follows:

1. Fights with all its strength for the immediate and complete confiscation of all the lands owned by the rich landlords (as well as appanages, church lands, crown lands, etc., etc.);
2. Stands for the immediate turning over of all lands to the peasantry organised in Soviets of Peasants' Deputies or in some other organs of local self-government consisting of representatives elected in a thoroughly democratic manner and completely independent of landowners and bureaucrats;
3. Demands the nationalisation of all lands in the state; while

the title to the land is in the hands of the state, nationalisation implies that the state turns over the right of managing the land to local democratic institutions;

4. Upholds the initiative of those peasant committees which in many localities throughout Russia are transferring the rich land-owners' live stock as well as implements to the peasants organised into such committees for the purpose of socially regulated utilisation of such stock and implements in the cultivation of all land.

5. Urges the village proletarians and semi-proletarians to try to transform each private estate into a sufficiently large model farm, to be conducted, at the expense of the community, by the local Soviet of agricultural workers, under the direction of trained agriculturists, with the use of the best technical appliances.

Finally, the conclusion of the agrarian programme, from the words: "Under all circumstances and under whatever conditions the democratic agrarian reform may occur" to the words: "All exploitation," leave intact.

The conclusion of the entire programme, the last two paragraphs (from the words "striving to achieve" to the very end) eliminate completely.

Written in the beginning of May, 1917.

III

CONCERNING THE REMARKS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN APRIL CONFERENCE

CONCERNING the remarks dealing with the general part of the programme, I must say the following:

In my opinion, there is no need for reworking the entire general part of the programme. The plan for such a change as suggested by the committee seems to me theoretically incorrect. In its present form the general part of the programme contains a description and analysis of the cardinal and most essential features of capitalism as a socio-economic system. Fundamentally these features have *not* been changed by imperialism, the era of finance capital. Im-

perialism is a continuation of the development of capitalism, its highest stage; it is—in a sense—the transition stage from capitalism to Socialism.

I do not see where the addition of an analysis of imperialism to the general analysis of the basic features of capitalism is “mechanical.” Imperialism, in fact, neither does, *nor can, transform* capitalism from top to bottom. Imperialism aggravates and sharpens the contradictions of capitalism, it “intertwines” monopoly with free competition, but it *cannot abolish* exchange, the market, competition, crises, etc.

Imperialism is capitalism passing out, not capitalism gone; it is capitalism dying, not dead. Not pure monopolies, but monopolies alongside of competition, exchange, markets, and crises,—this, generally, is the most essential feature of imperialism.

This is why it is theoretically unsound to delete the general analysis of exchange, of production for the market, of crises, etc., and to “replace” it by an analysis of imperialism *as a whole*. There is no such whole. There is the *transition* from competition to monopoly, and our programme therefore would be much more correct and much more true to life if it retained the general analysis of exchange, production for the market, crises, etc., and had a characterisation of the *growing* monopolies added to it. It is this very combination of contradictory principles, of competition and monopoly, that is the essence of imperialism, it is this that leads to the final crash, the Socialist revolution.

In Russia, especially, it would be unsound to depict imperialism as an integrated whole (imperialism is altogether not an integrated whole)—because in Russia there are still many realms and branches of labour that are only passing from the stage of natural or semi-natural economy to capitalism. These are antiquated, these are weak, but after all they do exist, and under certain circumstances they may cause delay in the downfall of capitalism.

The programme proceeds—and it should proceed—from the simplest phenomena of capitalism to the more complex and “higher” ones, from exchange to production for the market, to the crowding out of small industries by the larger ones, to crises, etc., all the way to imperialism which is the highest stage of capitalism and which is growing and has grown only now in the advanced countries. This is how matters stand in life. To begin by placing

"exchange" in general next to the export of capital is historically unsound and theoretically incorrect.

These are my objections to the remarks made by the committee.

Written May, 1917.

IV

DRAFT OF REVISED PROGRAMME

THE OLD AND THE NEW TEXTS OF THE PROGRAMME

To enable the reader more easily and more conveniently to compare the old and the new texts of the programme, both texts are printed in the following manner:

Ordinary type is used in setting up those parts of the old programme which remain unchanged in the new.

Italics are used for those parts of the old programme which have been completely omitted in the new programme. [In the present edition these parts are set in smaller type.—*Ed.*]

Bold italics are used for those parts of the new programme which were not in the old programme. [In the present edition these parts are set in italics.—*Ed.*]

PROGRAMME OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY

THE development of exchange has established such close ties among all the peoples of the civilised world that the great proletarian movement toward emancipation was bound to become—and has long since become—international.

Considering itself one of the detachments of the universal army of the proletariat, the Russian Social-Democracy is pursuing the same ultimate goal as that for which the Social-Democrats in other countries are striving. This ultimate goal is determined by the character of modern bourgeois society and by the course of its development. The chief feature of such a society is production for the market on the basis of capitalist production relations whereby the largest and most important part of the means of production and exchange of commodities belongs to a numerically small class

of people, while the overwhelming majority of the population consists of proletarians and semi-proletarians who, by their economic situation, are forced either continually or at intervals to sell their labour power, *i.e.*, to hire themselves out to the capitalists, and by their labour to create the incomes of the upper classes of society.

The expansion of the capitalist system of production runs parallel to technical progress, which, by increasing the economic importance of large enterprises, tends to eliminate the small independent producers, to convert some of them into proletarians, to reduce the socio-economic rôle of others and, in some localities, to place them in more or less complete, more or less open, more or less onerous dependence on capital.

Moreover, the same technical progress enables the enterprisers to utilise to an ever-greater extent woman and child labour in the process of production and exchange of commodities. And since, on the other hand, technical improvements lead to a decrease in the enterpriser's demand for human labour power, the demand for labour power necessarily lags behind the supply, and there is in consequence greater dependence of hired labour upon capital, and increased exploitation of the former by the latter.

Such a state of affairs in the bourgeois countries, as well as the ever-growing competition among those countries on the world market, render the sale of goods which are produced in greater and greater quantities ever more difficult. Overproduction with the resulting more or less acute industrial crises, which in turn are followed by more or less protracted periods of industrial stagnation, are the inevitable consequences of the development of the productive forces in bourgeois society. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation in their turn tend still further to impoverish the small producers, still further to enhance the dependence of hired labour upon capital, still further to accelerate the relative, and sometimes the absolute, deterioration of the condition of the working class.

Thus, technical progress, signifying increased productivity of labour and greater social wealth, becomes in bourgeois society the cause of more striking social inequalities, of more unbridgeable gulfs between the wealthy and the poor, of greater insecurity of existence, of unemployment, and of numerous privations for ever larger and larger masses of toilers.

But together with the growth and development of all these contradictions inherent in bourgeois society, there is the concomitant

growth of dissatisfaction with the present order among the toiling and exploited masses, the concomitant growth in the number and solidarity of the proletarians, as well as the sharpening of their struggle against the exploiters. At the same time, technical progress, by concentrating the means of production and exchange, by socialising the process of labour in capitalist enterprises, creates more and more rapidly the material possibility for replacing capitalist production relations by Socialist ones, *i. e.*, the possibility for a Socialist revolution, which is the ultimate aim of all the activities of international Social-Democracy as the class-conscious expression of the proletarian movement.

By introducing social, instead of private, ownership of the means of production and exchange, by introducing well-regulated organisation in the social process of production so that the well-being and the many-sided development of all members of society may be insured, the social revolution of the proletariat will abolish the division of society into classes and thus emancipate all of oppressed humanity, and will put an end to all forms of exploitation of one part of society by another.

A necessary condition for this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, *i. e.*, the conquering by the proletariat of such political power as would enable it to crush any resistance offered by the exploiters. In its effort to make the proletariat capable of fulfilling its great historical mission, international Social-Democracy organises it into an independent political party in opposition to all bourgeois parties, directs all the manifestations of its class struggle, discloses before it the irreconcilable conflict between the interests of the exploiters and those of the exploited, and clarifies for it the historical significance of the imminent social revolution, and the conditions necessary for its coming. At the same time, it reveals to the other sections of the toiling and the exploited masses the hopelessness of their condition in capitalist society and the need of a social revolution if they wish to be free of the capitalist yoke. The party of the working class, the Social-Democracy, calls upon all strata of the toiling and exploited population to join its ranks in so far as they adopt the point of view of the proletariat.

At the present time, approximately since the beginning of the twentieth century, world capitalism has reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, represents such a highly developed capitalist economy when monopolist

combines of capitalists—syndicates, cartels, trusts—have assumed decisive importance, enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital, the export of capital into foreign countries has grown to colossal dimensions, the whole globe has been territorially partitioned among the richest countries, and the economic partitioning of the world among international trusts has begun.

Imperialist wars, i. e., wars for world domination, for markets where banking capital can be utilised, for the stifling of small and weak peoples, are inevitable in such a state of affairs. And it is precisely this that characterises the first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-1917.

The exceedingly high stage of development attained by world capitalism in general; the displacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism; the preparation, owing to the development of banks and capitalist combines, of an apparatus for social regulation of the process of production and distribution of goods; the rising cost of living resulting from the growth of capitalist monopolies, and the increasing pressure exerted by such syndicates over the working class; the horrors and suffering, the ruin and madness bred by the imperialist war—all these put together make the present stage in capitalist development an era of proletarian and Socialist revolution.

This era has begun.

Only a proletarian, Socialist revolution is able to lead humanity out of the blind alley created by imperialism and imperialist wars. Whatever difficulties, possible temporary reverses, and waves of counter-revolution the revolution may encounter, the final victory of the proletariat is certain.

In view of the objective conditions, the first thing to do now is to prepare the proletariat, immediately and on all points, for the conquering of political power, in order to be able to bring into life political and economic changes that form the content of a Socialist revolution.

The fulfillment of this task requires the fullest trust, the closest fraternal ties, the completest unity of revolutionary action of the entire working class in all the advanced countries; the task cannot be carried out without an immediate break, in principle, from the bourgeois perversion of Socialism which has gained the upper hand

among the leadership of an overwhelming majority of the official Social-Democratic parties. Such a perversion is, on the one hand, the tendency toward social-chauvinism, Socialism in words, chauvinism in deeds, the use of the slogan "national defence" for the purpose of protecting the predatory interests of their own national bourgeoisie; on the other hand, the equally wide and international movement of the so-called "centre" which stands for unity with the social-chauvinists and for the preservation or rectification of the bankrupt Second International—a movement oscillating between social-chauvinism and the revolutionary international struggle of the proletariat for the realisation of a Socialist order.

On the road toward their common final goal which is conditioned by the prevalence of the capitalist system of production throughout the civilised world, the Social-Democrats of different countries must needs devote themselves to different immediate tasks,—first, because the capitalist system is not everywhere developed to the same degree; secondly, because in different countries its development takes place in a different socio-political setting.

In Russia, where capitalism has already become the dominant mode of production, there are still preserved numerous vestiges of the old pre-capitalist order, when the toiling masses were the serfs of the rich landowners, the state, or the head of the state.

Greatly hampering economic progress, these vestiges interfere with the many-sided development of the class struggle of the proletariat, help to preserve and strengthen the most barbarous forms of exploitation which the state and the propertied classes foist upon millions and millions of peasants, and keep the whole people in darkness and subjection.

The most outstanding among these relics of the past, the mightiest bulwark of all this barbarism, is the tsarist monarchy. In its very nature it is bound to be inimical to any social movement, cannot but be bitterly opposed to all the aspirations of the proletariat toward freedom.

By reason of the above, the first and immediate task put before itself by the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is to overthrow the tsarist monarchy and to create a democratic republic whose constitution would guarantee the following:

At the present moment in Russia, when the Provisional Government, which is part and parcel of the capitalist class and enjoys the confidence—not absolutely, to be sure—of the vast masses of the petty-bourgeois population, has undertaken to convene a Constituent Assembly,—the party of the proletariat is confronted with the immediate task of striving for a system of state organisation which would best secure economic progress and the rights of the people as a whole, and also make the transition into Socialism as painless as possible.

The party of the proletariat cannot confine itself to a bourgeois-

parliamentary democratic republic, which throughout the world maintains and strives to perpetuate monarchist means for oppressing the masses, namely, the police, the standing army, and the privileged bureaucracy.

The party fights for a more democratic workers' and peasants' republic, wherein the police and the standing army would be completely eliminated and replaced by a general arming of the people, by a universal militia; all the officers would be not only elective, but also subject to instant recall by a majority of electors; all officers, without exception, would be paid at the rate of the average wage of a skilled worker; all representative parliamentary institutions would gradually give place to Soviets of the people's representatives (from various classes and professions, or from various localities), functioning both as legislative and executive bodies.

The constitution of the democratic republic of Russia must ensure:

1. *The sovereignty of the people; the whole power of the state must be in the hands of the people's representatives,—elected by the people and subject to instant recall—who are to constitute one popular assembly, one chamber.*

1. *The sovereignty of the people, i. e., the concentration of all supreme state power in the hands of a legislative assembly, consisting of the people's representatives, and forming one chamber.*

2. *Universal, equal, and direct suffrage for all male and female citizens, twenty years old or over, at all elections to the legislative assembly and to the various local organs of self-government; the secret ballot at elections; the right of every voter to be elected into any representative institution; biennial parliaments; salaries to be paid to the people's representatives; proportional representation at all elections; recall, without exception, of all delegates and elected officers, at any time, by the will of the majority of their electors.*

3. *Local self-government on a wide scale; home rule for all localities where the population is of a special composition and characterised by special conditions of life; abolition of all state-appointed local and district offices.*

4. *Inviolability of person and dwelling.*

5. *Unlimited freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, strikes, and unions.*

6. *Freedom of movement and occupation.*

7. *Abolition of feudal estate; equal rights for all citizens irrespective of sex, creed, race, or nationality.*

8. The right of any people to receive instruction in its own tongue, this to be secured by creating schools at the expense of the state and the local organs of self-government; the right of every citizen to use his native language at meetings; introduction of the use of the native language on a par with the state language in all local, public, and state institutions; *the obligatory state language to be abolished.*

9. The right of self-determination for all nations included in the composition of the state.

9. *The right of all nationalities which are now part of the Russian state freely to separate and to form independent states. The republic of the Russian people should draw to itself other peoples or nationalities not through violence, but through voluntary and mutual agreement to build a common state. The common aims and brotherly union of the workers of all countries are incompatible with either direct or indirect violence practiced upon other nationalities.*

10. The right of any person to sue any official in the regular way before a jury.

11. Election of judges by the people.

11. *Election by the people of judges and other officers, in civil service as well as in the army, and recall of any of them, at any time, by the will of the majority of their electors.*

12. Replacement of the standing army by a general arming of the people.

12. *Replacement of the police and the standing army by a general arming of the people; workers and employees to receive their regular wages from the capitalists for the time given to public service in the people's militia.*

13. Separation of church and state, and of school and church; *the school to be absolutely secular.*

14. Free and compulsory general and professional education for all children of both sexes up to the age of sixteen; the state to provide poor children with food, clothing, and school supplies.

14. *Free and compulsory, general and technical education (familiarising the student with the theoretical and practical aspects of all the most important branches of industry) for all children of both sexes up to the age of 16; such education to be closely connected with socially productive labour of children.*

15. *State aid to students in the form of food, clothing, and school supplies.*

16. *Transfer of all matters pertaining to education into the hands of the democratic organs of local self-government; the central government not to interfere in any way with the arrangement of the school curriculum, nor with the selection of the teaching staff; the selection of teachers to be made directly by the population itself and the population to have the right to remove undesirable teachers.*

As a basic condition for the democratisation of our state economy, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party demands the abolition of all indirect taxes and the establishment of a progressive tax on incomes and inheritances.

On the one hand, the great development of capitalism in the banking business and in the trustified branches of industry, and on the other hand, the economic chaos brought on by the imperialist war and the consequent widespread demand for state and public control over the production and distribution of the most important products, impel the party to demand the nationalisation of banks, syndicates (trusts), etc.

In order to safeguard the working class against physical and moral degeneration, as well as to insure the development of its powers to carry on the struggle for freedom, the party demands the following:

1. Eight-hour work-day for all hired labour.

1. *Eight-hour work-day for all hired labour, allowing, in case the work is continuous, for not less than an hour's time for eating. In all industries dangerous to health the work-day must be shortened to from four to six hours.*

2. A law providing a weekly uninterrupted forty-two-hour respite for all hired labour, both male and female, in all the branches of national industry.

3. Complete prohibition of overtime work.

4. Prohibition of night work (from 9 P.M. to 6 A.M.) in all the branches of national economy, with the exception of those in which this is absolutely necessary because of technical considerations approved by labour organisations.

4. *Prohibition of night work (from 8 P.M. to 6 A.M.) in all the branches of national economy, with the exception of those in which this is absolutely necessary because of technical considerations ap-*

proved by labour organisations,—provided, however, that no night work should exceed four hours.

5. Prohibition of the employment of children of school age (up to sixteen) and restriction of the working day of minors (from 16 to 18) to six hours.

5. *Prohibition of the employment of children of school age (up to 16), restriction of the working day of minors (from 16 to 20) to four hours, and prohibition of the employment of all minors in night work, in industries injurious to health, and in mines.*

6. Prohibition of woman labour in all branches of industry injurious to women's health; relief from work for women four weeks before and six weeks after childbirth, with regular wages paid during all this period.

6. *Prohibition of woman labour in all branches of industry injurious to women's health; prohibition of night work for women; relief from work for women eight weeks before and eight weeks after childbirth, with regular wages paid during all this period, and free medical and pharmaceutical aid given.*

7. Nurseries for babies to be established in all shops, factories and other enterprises that employ women; recesses to be granted of at least half-hour duration, at three-hour intervals, to all nursing mothers.

7. *Nurseries for babies and places where mothers can nurse their babies to be established in all shops, factories and other enterprises that employ women; recesses to be granted of at least half-hour duration, at regular three-hour intervals, to all nursing mothers; such mothers to be provided with assistance, and their work-day to be reduced to six hours.*

8. Old age state insurance, also insurance against total or partial disability; such insurance to be based on a special fund formed from a tax levied on the capitalists for this purpose.

8. *Full social insurance:*

A. *For workers engaged in every kind of hired labour;*

B. *Against all kinds of loss of working power, namely, sickness, injury, infirmity, old age, occupational disease, childbirth, widowhood, orphanhood, as well as unemployment, etc.;*

C. *Full administration by the insured of all insurance institutions;*

D. *All insurance to be at the expense of the capitalists;*

E. *Free medical and pharmaceutical aid, to be managed by self-*

governing Sick Funds whose management to be elected by the workers.

9. Payment of wages in kind to be prohibited; establishment of regular weekly pay days when all wages should be paid in money in absolute conformity with all the agreements relating to the hire of workers; wages to be paid during working hours.

10. Deductions by employers from workers' wages, on any ground or for any purpose (fines, spoilage, etc.), are to be prohibited.

11. An adequate number of factory inspectors to be appointed in all branches of national industry, and their supervision to be extended to all enterprises employing hired labour, including government enterprises (domestic service also to be within the sphere of their supervision); special women inspectors to be appointed in those industries where woman labour is employed; participation of representatives, elected by the workers and paid by the state, in supervising the enforcement of the factory laws, the fixing of wage scales, in accepting or rejecting the finished products and other results of labour.

9. Establishment of labour inspection, for all forms of enterprises employing hired labour, including domestic service,—inspectors to be elected from and by labour organisations; establishment of an institute of women inspectors in undertakings employing woman labour.

12. Organs of local self-government, together with representatives elected by the workers, to have control over sanitation in the dwellings assigned to the workers by the employers, as well as over the inside arrangements in those dwellings and the renting conditions,—this for the purpose of shielding the workers against the employers' interference with their life and activity as private citizens.

13. Establishment of regularly organised sanitary control over all undertakings employing hired labour, the medico-sanitary organisation to be entirely independent of the employers; in time of sickness, free medical aid to be supplied to the workers at the expense of the employers, with the workers retaining their wages.

14. Employers' infringement upon the laws intended to protect the workers to be punished as a crime.

10. A sanitary code to be published dealing with the improvement of hygienic conditions and the preservation of life and health of workers in all enterprises employing hired labour; sanitation matters to be transferred to an organisation of sanitation inspection elected by the workers.

11. Housing laws to be enacted and housing inspection boards composed of members elected from the workers' organisations for supervising the sanitation of dwellings to be formed. However, only abolition of private ownership of land and the erection of cheap and hygienic quarters can solve the housing problem.

12. *Establishment of industrial courts in all branches of national industry.*

15. Establishment of industrial courts in all branches of national industry, the courts to be composed of equal numbers of representatives from workers' and employers' organisations.

16. Imposition upon the organs of local self-governments of the duty of establishing employment bureaus (labour exchanges) to deal with the hire of local and out-of-town labour in all branches of industry; workers' and employers' representatives to participate in their administration.

13. *Labour exchanges to be established for the proper organisation of the finding of work for the unemployed. Such labour exchanges must be proletarian class organisations (organised not on a parity basis) closely connected with labour unions and other working-class organisations, and financed by the communal self-governments.*

Having as its aim the removal of the vestiges of serfdom that fall directly and heavily upon the peasants, wishing to encourage the free development of the class struggle in the villages, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party demands:

1. Removal from the peasants of all feudal estate restrictions relative to persons and property.

2. Removal of all payments and duties connected with the feudal estate disqualification of the peasantry, and abolition of all debts imposing usurers' burdens.

3. Confiscation of all church lands, monastery lands, appanages, and crown lands, as well as of all state lands, and their transfer to the higher organs of local self-government combining the urban and the rural districts; lands needed for the migration fund, and also forests and waters of importance to the state, to be transferred to the democratic state.

4. Confiscation of privately owned lands, excepting small land-holds, and transfer of their management to democratically elected higher organs of local self-government. The minimum size of an estate subject to confiscation to be determined by the higher organs of local self-government. While supporting all revolutionary actions of the peasantry, including confiscation of large estates, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party will always and unconditionally oppose any intent at hindering the natural development of economic progress. While striving, in case of a victorious development of the revolution, to transfer all confiscated lands to the democratic institutions of local self-government, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is ready, if circumstances prove unfavourable for such a transfer, to advocate that all privately owned estates which are actually managed on a petty-economy basis or which are indispensable for rounding out the peasants' holdings, be divided among the peasants.

1. *Fights with all its strength for the immediate and complete confiscation of all the lands owned by the rich landlords (as well as appanages, church lands, crown lands, etc., etc.);*

2. *Stands for the immediate turning over of all lands to the peo-*

antry organised in Soviets of Peasants' Deputies or in some other organs of local self-government consisting of representatives elected in a thoroughly democratic manner and completely independent of landlords and bureaucrats;

3. Demands the nationalisation of all the lands in the state; the whole title to the land is in the hands of the state, nationalisation implies that the state turns over the right of managing the land to local democratic institutions;

4. Upholds the initiative of those peasant committees which in many localities throughout Russia are transferring the rich land-owners' live stock as well as implements to the peasants organised into such committees for the purpose of socially regulated utilisation of such stock and implements in the cultivation of all lands.

5. Urges the village proletarians and semi-proletarians to try to transform each private estate into a sufficiently large model farm, to be conducted, at the expense of the community, by the local Soviet of agricultural workers under the direction of trained agriculturists, with the use of the best technical appliances.

Under all circumstances, and under whatever conditions the democratic agrarian reform may occur, the party will unswervingly strive for an independent class organisation of the rural proletariat, it will endeavour to disclose to it the irreconcilable conflict between its interests and those of the peasant bourgeoisie, to warn it against the seduction of the petty-economy system which, as long as commodity production exists, can never eliminate the poverty of the masses, and, finally, to reveal to it the need for a complete Socialist overturn, as the only way of abolishing all poverty and all exploitation.

Striving to achieve its immediate ends, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party supports all oppositional or revolutionary movements directed against the present social and political order in Russia, but at the same time it definitely rejects all reformist projects which look toward the widening or strengthening of the guardianship of the police and bureaucracy over the labouring classes.

On its own part, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party is firmly convinced that a full, consistent, and thorough realisation of the indicated political and social changes can only be attained by the overthrow of autocracy and by the convocation of a Constituent Assembly freely elected by the entire people.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

EXPLANATORY NOTES

1. The two letters to A. M. Kollontai represent Lenin's first written reaction to the telegraphic reports concerning the March Revolution in Russia. The letters were written in Zürich on March 16 and 17.—p. 19.
2. *Sotsial-Democrat* (*Social-Democrat*) was the name of the central organ of the Bolsheviks published in Geneva in the Russian language. In Number 58, published January 31, 1917, in an article entitled "A Turn in World Politics," Lenin wrote the following concerning the possibilities of a separate peace between Tsarist Russia and Wilhelmist Germany: "The Tsar could have said to Wilhelm: If I openly sign a separate peace, to-morrow, my august partner, you will be confronted with a government of Miliukov-Guchkov, if not actually of Miliukov-Kerensky, for the revolution is maturing, and I cannot vouch for the army. Its generals are corresponding with Guchkov, and its officers to-day are for the most part the high school graduates of yesterday." (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XIX.)—p. 19.
3. The official name of the party of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie formed after the 1905 Revolution and widely known as the Constitutional-Democratic Party. After the March Revolution, the party played a prominent rôle in the Provisional Government, the Foreign Minister of which was Paul Miliukov, the leader of the party. Since the establishment of the Soviet Government, the outstanding leaders of the party have lived abroad as émigrés, constituting an active counter-revolutionary political group.—p. 19.
4. The popular appellation of the Constitutional-Democratic Party derived from its initials and pronounced *ka* and *deh* in Russian.—p. 20.
5. At that time the Socialist Labour Party was considered to have revolutionary internationalist leanings.—p. 20.
6. Left Dutch Socialists, grouped around the Left-radical weekly, *De Tribune*, which was founded in 1907 (hence they were also called Tribunists). In 1909, they were expelled from the official Socialist Party of Holland. During the war, this group carried on an energetic anti-imperialist agitation and collaborated with Lenin and Radek on the journal *Vorbote*, published in Switzerland in the German language. They joined the Communist International when it was organised. Pannekoek, Gorter, Henrietta Roland-Holst, Wynkoop, Ravesteyn and others belonged to this group.—p. 20.
7. The revolutionary period in England between 1640 and 1660, which resulted in the overthrow of the monarchy and the execution of Charles I, is referred to in history as the "great rebellion," while the substitution of

William of Orange for James II as King of England in 1688 by parliamentary action has become known as the "glorious revolution."—p. 20.

8. This refers to the Bolshevik Deputies in the Fourth Imperial Duma: Petrovsky, Muranov, Badaiev, Samoilov and Shagov who, together with Kamenev, the party leader of the Duma fraction, were arrested and sentenced to exile to Siberia in 1915 for their anti-war activity. Most of them returned to Petrograd immediately after the Revolution in March, 1917.—p. 20.

9. Socialists who supported the war and were opposed to revolutionary action, strikes and other manifestations of the class struggle which would interfere with the prosecution of the war.—p. 21.

10. Organisation Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party was the name assumed by the leading committee of the Mensheviks. It was formed in 1912 at the so-called "August" Conference and functioned until the election of the Central Committee of the Menshevik group in 1917.—p. 21.

11. See the letter to A. M. Kollontai of March 17, 1917 (p. 21 of this book) in which Lenin states that he and Zinoviev are working on theses which will characterise the situation and give a general outline of the next tasks of the Bolshevik Party. The draft of the theses was found among the papers of G. Zinoviev. This draft may be viewed as the first outline of the fundamental principles of Bolshevik tactics in the Revolution of 1917.—p. 23.

12. A political party of the big bourgeoisie formed after the 1905 Revolution and calling itself the "Party of October 17," the date of the Tsar's manifesto, October 17 (30), 1905, convoking the Imperial Duma and granting other civil rights which were withdrawn after the victory of the counter-revolution.—p. 23.

13. The Manifesto of the Provisional Executive Committee of the Imperial Duma "To the Citizens" announced the formation of the Provisional Government as well as the following governmental programme:

1. Complete and immediate amnesty for all political and religious offences, including terrorist acts, military revolts, agrarian insurrections, etc.

2. Freedom of speech, press, assembly, union, strikes, and the extension of all political liberties to persons in the military service within the limits required by considerations of technical military necessity.

3. Abolition of all feudal estate and national restrictions.

4. Immediate preparation for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly on the basis of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage. This Constituent Assembly shall determine the form of State and the constitution of the country.

5. Formation of a people's militia with elected officers subordinated to the organs of local self-government and taking the place of the police.

6. Elections to the local organs of self-government on the basis of universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage.

7. The troops who participated in the revolutionary movement are not to be disarmed and are to remain in Petrograd.

8. While maintaining a rigid military discipline in the service, all obstacles are to be eliminated preventing soldiers from exercising the public rights enjoyed by other citizens.—p. 24.

14. At the suggestion of the Provisional Executive Committee of the Duma, Nicholas II abdicated in favour of his brother, Michael. The Duma Committee negotiated with the latter concerning his ascension to the throne, but was compelled to drop this plan under the pressure of the workers and soldiers of Petrograd. Michael Romanov then renounced the throne and declared that he would accept the crown only when tendered by the Constituent Assembly.—p. 25.

15. Zemstvo—elective provincial representative assembly. The zemstvos joined the liberal bourgeoisie in the movement against the autocracy for a constitutional form of government.—p. 25.

16. Formed in 1898 by the unification of the various labour groups representing Marxian Socialism, the party split into two political tendencies at the Second Congress of the party in 1903—Bolsheviks and Mensheviks—constituting the revolutionary and reformist wings respectively of the Socialist movement in Russia. Following the overthrow of Russian tsarism, the Mensheviks developed into open counter-revolutionists. The Bolsheviks used the name of the party, later changing it to Communist Party.—p. 25.

17. Derived from *Narod*, Russian for people. Representatives of various populist-Socialist tendencies.—p. 26.

18. Literal translation of the Russian *oborontsy*, those favouring the *defence* of Russia during the imperialist war conducted by the Tsar's and later by the Provisional Government jointly with the Allied Powers.—p. 26.

19. The "Letters from Afar" were written by Lenin in Switzerland April 2-8, 1917. Only the first letter, entitled "The First Stage of the First Revolution," reached Petrograd; it was published in Numbers 14 and 15 of the *Pravda*. The four other letters were not published in 1917. They appeared for the first time in 1924 in Number 2 of the *Lenin Collection* (Russian). The fifth letter ("Problems of Revolutionary Proletarian Organisation of the State") was begun on April 8, on the day of Lenin's departure from Switzerland, but was never completed.—p. 27.

20. Manifesto of the Extraordinary Socialist Congress in Basel (November 24 and 25, 1912). The Congress was convened as a result of the Balkan War which upset the equilibrium of the imperialist states and exposed the danger of a world war. Only one question was on the agenda of the Congress—the question of war. Revolutionary resolutions were passed. The manifesto known as the *Basel Manifesto* was unanimously adopted, confirming the resolutions of the Stuttgart and Copenhagen Congresses on the war. The Socialist parties of all countries obligated themselves to resist the outbreak of a war with every means at their disposal, and, in case it should break out, they were to oppose it with all their might. When, nearly two years later, the imperialist war, foreseen by the Basel Congress, actually broke out, the leaders of the Second International forgot these resolutions and the official Social-Democratic parties, with the exception of the Russian,

Italian, Bulgarian and Serbian and revolutionary minorities in Socialist parties of other countries, supported the war and their respective bourgeoisies.—p. 30.

21. Reference is made to the Revolution of 1905 with its traditions of the general strike in October and the Moscow uprising in December which Lenin particularly considered of great importance on account of the experience it gave the Russian workers in revolutionary struggle and the lessons derived from the defeat suffered at the time.—p. 30.

22. Certain political circles in Petrograd prepared the abdication of Nicholas II and the regency of Michael in the months of January and February, 1917. The murder of the Tsar's almighty favourite, Grigory Rasputin, by Purishkevich, the well-known leader of the "Black Hundred," and Prince Yusupov, a relative of the Tsar's family (the former Grand Duke Dimitri Pavlovich also participated in the murder) in December, 1916, did not lead to the expected "rejuvenation" of the highest state power and the elimination of the influence of the circles dangerous to the anglophilic war party. Hence the plan to eliminate Nicholas II by means of a Palace revolution in order to place his heir, Alexei, who was a minor, on the throne under the regency of Michael Romanov.

Several Deputies of the Duma belonging to the Progressive Bloc (which had arisen during the war and consisted of the parties of the Cadets, the Progressives, the Octobrists and a part of the Rights), several generals and other persons (as, for example, Tereshchenko, later Finance Minister and then Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional Government), seemed to have participated in the conspiracy. Prince G. E. Lvov was to become Prime Minister. The English Ambassador, Sir Buchanan, was well informed of these plans, and possibly also other Entente ambassadors (as, for example, the French Ambassador Paléologue). To all appearances, the first Provisional Government, formed after the March Revolution, was nothing more than that "Cabinet of Public Confidence" which the conspirators planned upon the success of their venture.

These facts were unknown in 1917. Material made available during the last few years, however, contains direct indications as to the existence of this conspiracy, without revealing any details or its participants. In the first volume of his *History of the Russian Revolution*, Miliukov asserts that the March Revolution prevented the conspirators' plan from being carried out.

At the time that Lenin wrote his first "Letter from Afar" in Switzerland, he could not have known of the conspiracy of certain groups of the Russian bourgeoisie and the Anglo-French imperialists. On the basis of an analysis of the class struggle in Russia, however, and the influence of Anglo-French capital, he was able to arrive at correct conclusions.—p. 31.

23. A tendency among the Russian Socialists (Mensheviks) during the years of reaction following the Revolution of 1905 to *liquidate* the underground form of organisation for the purpose of carrying on only those open and legal activities permitted by the prevailing conditions.—p. 33.

24. The official organ of the Bolsheviks which resumed publication in Petrograd after the March Revolution.—p. 35.
25. The Provisional Executive Committee of the Duma was formed during the night of March 12, 1917.—p. 36.
26. The members of the Executive Committee were: M. V. Rodzianko, A. F. Kerensky, N. S. Chkhheidze, V. V. Shulgin, P. N. Miliukov, M. A. Karaulov, A. I. Konovalov, I. I. Dmitriukov, V. A. Rzhevsky, S. I. Shidlovsky, N. V. Nekrasov, V. N. Lvov and A. A. Bublikov.—p. 36.
27. The State Council was a sort of upper chamber beside the Imperial Duma and consisted, in part, of elected representatives of the nobility, the clergy, the chambers of commerce, universities, etc.; in part, of members appointed by the Tsar.—p. 36.
28. The All-Russian Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party was held in Prague January, 1912, consisting almost exclusively of Bolsheviks, with only two or three supporters of Plekhanov among them. This conference completed the formal breach with the Mensheviks, expelled the Liquidators, restored the revolutionary proletarian party by embracing all Social-Democratic organisations active in Russia, creating a new (Bolshevik) Central Committee. Hence the Bolsheviks referred to their party as the Social-Democratic Party of the Central Committee.—p. 38.
29. People's Socialist Party—a political group standing between the Cadets and the Socialists-Revolutionists, but without any influence upon the masses. It arose from a split in the ranks of the Socialists-Revolutionists in 1906. The leaders of the People's Socialists were Peshekhonov, Miakotin, Annensky and other literati grouped around the journal *Russkoie Bogatstvo* (*Russian Wealth*) founded by N. K. Mikhailovsky.—p. 38.
30. See note 10.—p. 38.
31. Social-Democratic Party of the Central Committee, i.e., the Bolshevik Party; see note 28.—p. 39.
32. Trudoviks—Labour Fraction. It was a parliamentary fraction formed in 1906 in the First Imperial Duma. The fraction was joined by liberal intellectuals, People's Socialists and peasant Deputies of revolutionary inclinations. The Trudovik Fraction was maintained through all four Dumas. The isolated Deputies of the Socialists-Revolutionists who were unable to organise their own fraction in the Third and Fourth Dumas also joined the Trudoviks and completely merged with them (Kerensky was the leader of the Trudoviks in the Fourth Duma). The Trudoviks' position on the war was essentially social-patriotic and in part even openly chauvinist.—p. 40.
33. *Nasha Zaria* (*Our Dawn*)—a journal published in Petrograd by the Menshevik Liquidators from 1910 to 1914. During the war, it was continued as *Nashe Dielo* and later *Dielo*.—p. 40.

34. The formation of the Provisional Government and the formulation of its programme followed an agreement between the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Provisional Executive Committee of the Duma on March 14. The Petrograd Soviet left the formation of the Provisional Government to the Executive Committee of the Duma and insisted on the recognition of a definite programme, the most important points of which to them were forbidding the removal of the revolutionary troops from Petrograd, and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly.—p. 40.

35. On March 18, the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet issued a proclamation to the people calling upon them to support the Provisional Government. It said, among other things:

The new state power formed from the socially moderate strata of society has announced all the reforms to-day which it obligates itself to carry through during the struggle with the old régime and partly after the completion of this struggle. Some of these reforms must be greeted by the widest democratic circles: political amnesty, the obligation to prepare for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the realisation of civil liberties and the abolition of national restrictions. . . . The complete victory of the Russian people over the old régime is approaching; but great efforts, solidarity, firmness are needed for the achievement of this victory. Division and anarchy must not be allowed. . . . The danger of a military movement against the revolution has not yet been overcome. To obviate this danger it is of the utmost importance that officers and soldiers collaborate wholeheartedly.—p. 41.

36. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*—a bourgeois daily newspaper founded in 1780, published in Zürich.—p. 41.

37. *National-Zeitung*—a Berlin liberal bourgeois newspaper founded in 1848.—p. 41.

38. The so-called "Contact Commission" of the Petrograd Soviet was established to maintain relations with the Provisional Government and to control it; it consisted of Skobelev, Steklov, Sukhanov, Chkhheidze and the officer Filippovsky (a Socialist-Revolutionist). The "Contact Commission" proved to be a stillborn child, attempting from time to time to "convince" the Provisional Government. In later articles, after he had received more exact information, Lenin treated the "Contact Commission" ironically as a model of class-collaborationist policy.—p. 41.

39. *Frankfurter Zeitung*—an important German bourgeois paper, published since 1856 in Frankfurt a.M.—p. 45.

40. The Bolshevik manifesto "To All Citizens of Russia," which was signed by the Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee of the party, was printed in Petrograd and distributed as a leaflet on March 11, 1917, while street fighting was still going on. The manifesto declared the goal of the revolution to be the creation of a democratic republic. It demanded of the future Provisional Government: Legislative guarantees of all rights and liberties of the people; confiscation of the monastery, feudal, crown and state lands

and their transfer to the people; the introduction of the 8-hour work-day, and the convocation of the Constituent Assembly.

It is the immediate . . . task of the Provisional Revolutionary Government—the manifesto stated—to establish relations with the proletariat of the bellicose countries for the purpose of leading a struggle of the peoples of all the countries against their oppressors and exploiters, against royal governments and capitalist cliques and for the purpose of terminating the bloody war carnage imposed upon the enslaved peoples against their will.

At the same time, the manifesto demanded the election of delegates to the Workers' and Soldiers' Soviet and emphasised the necessity of an alliance between the Russian and West-European proletariat. (The complete text of the Manifesto will be found among the appendices of Book II.)—p. 45.

41. *Vossische Zeitung*—an influential and well-informed German paper published since 1704 and connected with academic circles.—p. 45.

42. *Lietopis (Annals)*—a Marxist journal of internationalist orientation edited by Maxim Gorki and published in Petrograd from December, 1915, to the end of 1917. N. Sukhanov, V. Bazarov, A. Bogdanov and others collaborated on the journal.—p. 57.

43. V. I. Lenin: *Imperialism as the Final Stage of Capitalism*, first published in Petrograd in the summer of 1917. Available in English translation in pamphlet form. It will be published in a revised translation in Vol. XIX of Lenin's *Collected Works*. The introduction to this pamphlet will be found on p. 320 of this book.—p. 57.

44. The telegram of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Miliukov, of March 18, 1917, which was sent to the representatives of Russia abroad, was reproduced by the *Riech (Speech)*, the organ of the Cadets, as follows: ". . . The upheaval has been favourably received in all parts of Russia, for the fallen régime was hated and despised by every one. There were no defenders of the old régime and the establishment of the new order as well as the formation of the new government was effected with the unanimous consent of all classes of the population, the army and the front." The telegram expresses the conviction that the new government as well as all of Russia will act with complete unanimity and in full accord with their glorious allies.—p. 58.

45. The Agrarian Programme of the 104—the draft of a law which was introduced into the Second Imperial Duma and supported by 104 Deputies of the Trudovik Fraction (see note 32), mostly peasants. The draft demanded the nationalisation of the land.—p. 62.

46. *Die Neue Zeit*—the theoretical journal of the German Social-Democracy founded in 1883 and published under the editorship of Karl Kautsky until the war when Heinrich Cunow became editor. The journal was transformed into a technical journal in 1923. During the first three decades of its existence it was the most influential Marxist publication in the international Socialist movement, publishing many shorter writings of Marx and Engels and articles of leading Marxist writers from various countries.—p. 63.

47. This article was written about the same time as the fourth "Letter from Afar," but probably after this letter was finished. The article was obviously to serve as a proclamation of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks to the international proletariat, but was never completed.—p. 64.

48. The first Provisional Government, which was formed as a result of an agreement between the Executive Committee of the Imperial Duma and the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, was composed of the following: Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior, Prince G. E. Lvov; Minister of Foreign Affairs, P. N. Miliukov; Minister of Justice, A. F. Kerensky; Minister of Communications, N. V. Nekrasov; Minister of Trade and Industry, A. I. Konovalov; Minister of Education, A. A. Manuilov; Minister of War and Temporary Minister of the Navy, A. I. Guchkov; Minister of Agriculture, A. I. Shingarev; Minister of Finance, M. I. Tereshchenko; State Comptroller, I. V. Godnev; Procurator of the Holy Synod, V. N. Lvov; Minister of Finland, F. I. Rodichev.—p. 65.

49. The letter to Hanecki was sent from Zürich to Stockholm where Hanecki was living at the time. The Kuba mentioned in the letter is Hanecki himself.—p. 69.

50. *Die Glocke* (*The Bell*)—a Social-Democratic weekly published by Parvus, representing an extreme Right, social-chauvinist standpoint. Parvus, a former radical Socialist during the Revolution of 1905 and active in the Russian revolutionary movement, entered the service of German imperialism after the outbreak of the war. The journal was published at Berlin, and existed from 1915 to 1925.—p. 69.

51. A Socialist who took an anti-war attitude during the war, refusing to support the government in the prosecution of the war or to favour social peace. While the internationalists differed in this regard from the social-patriotic Mensheviks, they did not accept the Bolshevik programme of action during the war or after the March Revolution. In the summer of 1917, the true revolutionary internationalist elements joined the Bolsheviks. This fusion is discussed by Lenin in this book (p. 131, Book II of this volume).—p. 69.

52. For a characterisation of the attitude and rôle of Martov in the Russian Socialist movement see Biographical Notes in Book II.—p. 69.

53. For a characterisation of the attitude and rôle of Natanson in the Russian Socialist movement see Biographical Notes in Book II.—p. 69.

54. This refers to the pamphlet of G. Zinoviev and N. Lenin: *Socialism and the War*, Geneva, 1915.—p. 71.

55. *The Communist* (Russian) was published in 1915 by P. and N. Kievsky (G. Piatakov and Eugenie Bosh). Lenin, Zinoviev and Bukharin were contributors to the journal. Only the double number 1-2 appeared.—p. 71.

56. *Sbornik Sotsialdemocrata* (*Social-Democratic Collection*) appeared in Switzerland in 1916 under Lenin's close guidance. Only two numbers were published.—p. 71.

57. On March 23, 1917, while Lenin was still in Switzerland, L. B. Kamenev, together with the Bolshevik Duma Deputies, returned to Petrograd from exile (see note 8). Here he assumed the leadership of the party work and the editorship of the *Pravda*. It soon appeared, however, that he did not agree with Lenin's standpoint on essential questions. When Lenin published his famous "April Theses," Kamenev turned against Lenin the following day in the *Pravda* in an article entitled "Our Differences." This article, together with another published under the title "Without Secret Diplomacy," which testify to Kamenev's vacillations at that time, are to be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 73.

58. This article was written by Lenin on March 30, 1917, in Switzerland. He sent it in the form of a letter to the editors of the *Avanti* (see note 63) and the Zürich *Volksrecht* (see note 62). A copy of the article was sent by Lenin to his comrades in Stockholm. This copy was found among the papers of Shliapnikov.—p. 74.

59. *Corriere della Sera* (*Evening Courier*)—an Italian evening paper with a large circulation, published in Milan since 1876.—p. 74.

60. *L'Humanité* (*Humanity*)—formerly the central organ of the French Socialist Party, having been founded by Jean Jaurès in 1904 and edited by him till his death in 1914. During the war it was social-patriotic under the editorship of Pierre Renaudel. It was later edited by Jean Longuet when it was a reformist and pacifist organ. Since the split in the French Socialist Party in 1920, it has been the central organ of the Communist Party of France and is edited by Marcel Cachin, the French Communist Deputy and former co-worker of Jaurès.—p. 76.

61. *Petit Parisien* (*Little Parisian*)—a conservative Paris paper founded in 1876 and circulated mostly among the petty bourgeoisie.—p. 76.

62. *Volksrecht* (*People's Right*)—Social-Democratic paper published in Zürich and representing an internationalist standpoint during the war.—p. 76.

63. *Avanti* (*Forward*)—the central organ of the Italian Socialist Party published in Milan. Represented the internationalist standpoint during the war and was edited by Giacinto Serrati.—p. 76.

64. In Numbers 77 and 78 of March 31 and April 2, 1917, the Zürich *Volksrecht* published a report of one of Lenin's lectures under the title: "Lenin on the Russian Revolution." The editors of the *Volksrecht* added the following note:

Comrade Lenin who, as is well known, represents the most extreme Left tendency in the Russian Social-Democracy, recently delivered a lecture in Zürich on the tasks of the Social-Democracy in the Russian Revolution. His

views surely correspond to the tactics followed at present by a part of the Russian Socialists and therefore constitute a valuable contribution to the understanding of present events in Russia. We can only publish a short extract from the two-and-a-half-hour lecture.

The style and language of the report published in the *Volksrecht*, particularly the pregnancy of the basic thought and the clear, succinct and sharp formulation suggest that the report was written by Lenin himself or represents an extract of a larger report of his lecture which Lenin wrote.—p. 77.

65. See note 7.—p. 77.

66. See note 7.—p. 77.

67. Reference is made here to the Germanic influence at the Russian Court. The Tsarina was of German descent and high Russian military officials were in the employ of the German Government. The Allies supported the conservative and liberal bourgeoisie bent upon continuing the war to a victorious conclusion.—p. 77.

68. The National Convention assembled September 21, 1792, and assumed power following the victory of the first stage of the French Revolution and the deposition and imprisonment of the king. It was the Convention that tried King Louis XVI and condemned him to death. In the Convention a struggle took place between the Left elements represented by the *Mountain* (so-called because the delegates were seated on the top benches, among whom were the Jacobin leaders, Robespierre and Danton, spokesmen of the revolutionarily inclined petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, and Marat, the fearless champion of the lower classes—the workers and peasants), and the *Gironde* (the provincial delegates who came from the Gironde Department—Bordeaux); the Girondists opposed the extension of the Revolution and as the spokesmen of the emerging bourgeoisie represented the developing counter-revolution. The fall of Robespierre on July 27, 1794 (the 9th Thermidor), marked the triumph of the open counter-revolution. The Convention lasted until October 26, 1795, when the Directory assumed control of France with the aid of Napoleon.—p. 78.

69. The full text of the manifesto adopted on March 11 and published by the Bolshevik Central Committee is reprinted among the appendices in Book II.—p. 79.

70. The first cabinet of Prince Lvov, formed on March 14, 1917, as a result of an agreement with the Soviet of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies, Lenin calls the "Second Provisional Government" in contradistinction to the Provisional Executive Committee of the Duma, which was formed on March 12 and of which Chkhheidze was also a member. Living abroad, Lenin was naturally prevented from learning all the details of events occurring in Russia. He therefore considered the Provisional Committee of the Duma to a certain extent as the first Provisional Government.—p. 80.

71. See Karl Marx, *The Civil War in France*.—p. 80.

72. The "Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers" was written by Lenin and on his motion was adopted at a meeting of the departing Bolshevik emigrants held April 8, 1917. The letter was intended for publication in the Swiss Socialist press. Plekhanov published this "Farewell Letter" at that time in his newspaper *Yedinstvo (Unity)* as a proof of the dangerousness of Lenin's agitation. The text published in 1921 in Number 2 of the Russian journal *Proletarskaia Revolutsia (The Proletarian Revolution)* deviates somewhat from the text of the Lenin manuscript; the 1921 text undoubtedly contains some editorial changes made at the suggestion of those present at the meeting.—p. 82.

73. The International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald (Switzerland) held September 5-8, 1915, was convened by the Socialist Party of Italy for the purpose of discussing the attitude toward the war. At the Conference were represented partly the official parties as a whole (Italy, Russia, Rumania, etc.), partly the opposition and revolutionary minorities which had remained more or less faithful to the standpoint of internationalism. Altogether about 30 delegates appeared. The Russian representatives were: for the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks—Lenin and Zinoviev; for the Organisation Committee of the Mensheviks—Axelrod, Martov and Martinov; for the Socialists-Revolutionists—Natanson and Chernov; for the Lettish Social-Democracy—Bersin; Trotsky represented the editorial staff of the *Nashe Slovo* (see note 83); in addition, there was also a representative of the *Bund*. From Germany, the following participated: for the Haase-Ledebour Group (Independents)—Georg Ledebour, Adolf Hoffmann and Josef Herzfeld; the "Internationale" (*Spartacus*) Group was represented by Ernst Meyer and Bertha Thalheimer; in addition, Julian Borchardt was present as the representative of the International Socialists of Germany. Of the Polish Social-Democracy Radek (National Committee) and Warski (Executive Committee) participated, and Lapinski of the Left Polish Socialist Party. Italy sent several delegates. From France, Bourderon and Merrheim represented the minorities of the party and the trade unions; from Holland, Henrietta Roland-Holst (*De Internationale* Group); from Scandinavia, Höglund and Ture Nerman who officially represented the Swedish-Norwegian Youth League; the Rumanian Party was represented by Rakovsky; the Bulgarian by Kolarov. The Rumanian and Bulgarian delegation also represented the Inter-Balkan Socialist Federation. From Switzerland there was a personal representation, consisting of Robert Grimm, Charles Naine and Fritz Platten. The Independent Labour Party of England promised to participate, but was prevented from attending by the British Government, which refused the delegates passports. The American Socialist Party had no delegates at the Conference, but the Manifesto issued by the Conference was endorsed by a referendum of its membership soon after its publication. The majority of the Conference assumed a centrist position. Animated differences of opinion developed during the discussion of the manifesto which was to be issued. The Left Wing of the Conference, under Lenin's leadership, demanded a sharper formulation. The statement made by the Left Wing not only attacked the outright social-patriots in unmistakable terms, but also the "oppo-

sition-mannered centre around Kautsky." It raised the slogan of a revolutionary struggle against the World War and the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war: "Civil War, not civil peace—that is the slogan." This statement was rejected by the majority of the Conference; but it was voted for by the representatives of the Bolsheviks, the Lettish Party, the Polish National Committee, the Swedish-Norwegian Youth League, a German and a Swiss delegate. The Conference finally adopted unanimously the so-called *Zimmerwald Manifesto*. The Left Wing issued a statement, saying that while it wished to have more stress laid upon certain facts and the means of struggle more clearly indicated, still, since it was a question of a call to battle, it voted for the Manifesto in order to permit unity of action. A provisional centre was formed at the Conference, the International Socialist Commission to be located at Berne (after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, it was removed to Stockholm), consisting of Morgari (Italy), Charles Naine, Robert Grimm (Switzerland) and Angelica Balabanov (Secretary). The most important result of the Conference was the organisation of the "Zimmerwald Left," which provided itself with a programme and created an international centre. (The declaration of principles of the Zimmerwald Left, which was made at the Conference as well as the theses for the Kienthal Conference, are reproduced in the appendices in Book II.) The second conference of the Zimmerwaldians took place at Kienthal (Switzerland) April 24-30, 1916. About 40 delegates from different countries were present: Germany 7 delegates; France 4, England 1, Italy 8, Russia 8, Poland 5, Serbia 1, Portugal 1, Switzerland 5, and 1 delegate from the International Socialist Youth Secretariat. From Germany there were Adolf Hoffmann and Hermann Fleissner for the Ledebour Group, for the Spartacus Group Ernst Meyer and Bertha Thalheimer again; Paul Frölich represented the Bremen Left-radical group. From Russia practically the same delegates were present as at the first Conference. The Lets transferred their mandate to Lenin. The third and last Zimmerwald Conference took place at Stockholm on September 5, 1917 (see note 177). The Zimmerwald Union existed until the organisation of the Communist International in 1919 when it was dissolved.—p. 82.

74. On December 21, 1915, eighteen Deputies of the Minority Group of the Social-Democratic Reichstag Fraction, who were grouped around Hugo Haase and Georg Ledebour, finally decided to follow Liebknecht's example, and voted against the war credits in an open session of the Reichstag. The vote served to aggravate the relationship between the majority and the minority of the Fraction, but did not lead to a formal split. On March 24, 1916, came the decisive conflict. When one of the minority speakers attacked the official policy of the Social-Democratic Fraction, the eighteen deputies of the Haase-Ledebour Group were expelled from the Fraction. These in turn organised a separate fraction under the name of the Social-Democratic *Arbeitsgemeinschaft* which formed the basis for the organisation of the Independent Social-Democratic Party.—p. 82.

75. *Freie Jugend* (*Free Youth*)—internationalist semi-monthly organ of

the Social-Democratic Youth Organisation of Switzerland. Founded in 1906.—p. 83.

76. The Stolypin agrarian reform aimed at creating an economically strong stratum of peasant proprietors as a prop of the tsarist government in the village. The peasants were permitted to have their share of land recognised as their private property without the consent of the village commune (*Mir*), and within certain limits, to mortgage and dispose of it. The separation of the peasants from the village commune and their settling on separate farms of their own was pushed in every possible way. The proprietors separating from the commune received the support of the Peasant Bank by means of credits, etc. Tsarism, however, was not able to complete this reform before the outbreak of the Revolution of 1917. Nevertheless, it contributed to the further and stronger class differentiation of the village.—p. 86.

77. Members of the Fabian Society, a reformist-Socialist society founded at London in 1884 by Sidney Webb, George Bernard Shaw and others. It was named after the Roman General Fabius Maximus, called Cunctator (the Delayer), whose tactics in defeating Hannibal in the Second Punic War (3rd Century B.C.) consisted in avoiding direct engagements with the enemy. The Fabian Society was formed as a counteracting influence to the "Marxist" Social-Democratic Federation. The official aims of the society are: Revision of the English Constitution in a democratic spirit, and propaganda for a Socialist method of production. The Fabian Society is not a party in the proper sense of the word, but rather a club for study purposes, a propaganda society. The Fabians reject the theories of Marx, deny the class struggle as the driving force of social development and do not recognise the inevitability of the social revolution. The Society is a part of the Labour Party and the Second International.—p. 87.

78. Members of the British Labour Party; founded in 1906. The Labour Party is composed of trade unions and other labour organisations (co-operatives, Socialist clubs) which are affiliated to it, as well as of individual members who belong to any local election unit of the Labour Party. The possibility of individual membership in the Labour Party dates only from 1918. J. Ramsay MacDonald and Philip Snowden, conservative leaders of the Independent Labour Party, and James H. Thomas and other conservative trade-unionists are in the leadership of the Labour Party. The Labour Party belongs to the Second International where it occupies the Right Wing.—p. 87.

79. Spartacus group (*Spartacusbund*)—an illegal organisation founded at the beginning of the war by Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring and others, rallying the revolutionary elements in the old German Social-Democracy for a struggle against the war and against the Social-Democracy which had completely gone over to the bourgeois camp. Franz Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg tried to publish a legal journal under the title *Die Internationale* (*The International*), the first number of which appeared April 15, 1915. This journal took up a most vigorous struggle not only against the

official policy of the Social-Democracy, but also against the centrist Kautskyism. The journal was, of course, immediately suppressed. The group officially named itself after its journal, *Gruppe der Internationale* (*Group of the International*). A series of leaflets which it issued under the name of *Spartacus* caused the group to be called the *Spartacus Group*. (*Spartacus*—a Thracian leader of gladiators who led an uprising of slaves against Rome, 73-71 B.C.) When the Independent Social-Democratic Party was organised at Gotha in March, 1917, the Spartacus Group joined it for tactical reasons, but stated expressly at the convention that it not only reserved its freedom of agitation and criticism but also its independence of organisation and action. After the November, 1918, Revolution when the I.S.P., together with Ebert and Scheidemann, formed the Government of People's Deputies, the Spartacus Group separated from the I.S.P. and constituted itself together with several other Left-radical groups, on December 31, 1918, the Communist Party of Germany.—p. 87.

80. *Arbeiterpolitik* (*Labour Policy*)—weekly publication of the Left radicals founded by Johann Knief and Paul Frölich. It appeared legally in Bremen from May, 1916, up to the November Revolution. Karl Radek was one of its chief contributors, and it was through him that the group established closer connections with the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks (Lenin and Zinoviev).—p. 87.

81. Late in the evening of April 16, 1917, Lenin, together with the first emigrant group from Switzerland, arrived in Petrograd. The next day, April 17, Lenin and Zinoviev made a report concerning their journey through Germany before the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. At the same meeting of the Executive Committee Zurabov, a Menshevik-internationalist, spoke "On the Condition of the Emigrants in Switzerland." The following statement concerning Zurabov's talk is preserved in the minutes of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet:

A number of political emigrants have no opportunity of utilising the amnesty and of returning home, especially those who resided in Switzerland and the countries of southern Europe. The technical difficulties of the return trip entirely aside, the so-called "check lists" that were set up by the agents of the old régime with the co-operation of the representatives of the English and French general staffs, allegedly for struggle against military espionage, in reality contain the names of many prominent internationalists who represent the standpoint of the Zimmerwald-Kienthal Conferences. Zurabov, who was also on the list, while still in Copenhagen, informed the Executive Committee in the person of Comrade Chkhheidze of this by telegraph and upon his insistence, the Russian ambassador in Copenhagen informed Foreign Minister Miliukov that the Russian emigrants were insisting that the lists be not applied to them. Miliukov's reply, which was favourable in reference to Zurabov personally, confirmed the instructions to the consuls to guide themselves by the check lists in granting permission to return. In his further statements, Comrade Zurabov presented the request of the Swiss comrades that efforts be made to have the Executive Committee exert pressure upon the Provisional Government in order that it start negotiations with the German Government about letting the political emigrants pass through Germany in exchange for interned Germans or prisoners of war.

Zinoviev reported in the name of the group of emigrants which had trav-

elled through Germany. In the above-mentioned minutes, there is the following record of his speech:

Zinoviev reports on the difficulties presented by the English and French officials. He relates the history of the origin of the plan to travel through Germany. Originally it was intended that this occur by means of exchange for interned persons, but the red tape involved would have meant a delay and retarded the departure by months. With the co-operation of the Swiss Socialist Platten, they succeeded in accelerating the journey by going through Germany, whereby the travellers obligated themselves to influence the working masses so that in turn the same number of German subjects interned in Russia are returned, primarily the Socialist Otto Bauer. At their departure a written agreement was made which Comrade Zinoviev promises to hand in as soon as it arrives in Petrograd by mail. He proposes a resolution which approves of the exchange of political emigrants for interned persons.

After the discussion in which Lenin (the record of his speech contained in the minutes is reproduced in the text; see p. 94 of this book), Tsereteli, Bogdanov, Shliapnikov and Zurabov participated, the Executive Committee decided that "the delegation is instructed to raise the question of the political emigrants before the Government, temporarily to adopt no resolution on the passage through Germany, print all the factual material relevant to this question in the *Izvestia*, and publish a notice in the next number of the *Izvestia* on the report made by Comrade Lenin on the day of the arrival concerning the circumstances of the journey through Germany." The documents which refer to the journey through Germany will be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 91.

82. *Bund* (*League*)—abbreviated name of the General Jewish Workers' League in Lithuania, Poland and Russia, a Jewish Social-Democratic organisation. The *Bund* was founded in 1897, and, with the organisation of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, the following year, joined it as an autonomous body. When the second congress of the R.S.-D.L.P. (1903) expressed its adherence to the principle of rigid centralism, the *Bund* left the party. They were reunited in 1906 at the so-called unity convention at Stockholm. The *Bund* was close to the Mensheviks. It participated in the Zimmerwald Conference where it belonged to the Right Wing. During the war, most of the *Bundists* were either social-pacifists or outright social-patriots. In the process of the Civil War, the *Bund* in Soviet Russia became more and more revolutionary under the pressure of the proletarian masses. In 1921, it merged with the Communist Party of Russia. The *Bund* to-day exists as an independent organisation only in Poland, where it occupies essentially a centrist position.—p. 91.

83. *Nashe Slovo* (*Our Word*)—a daily paper published by Trotsky in Paris during the war. The following collaborated on the paper: Manuilsky, Antonov-Ovseienko, Lozovsky, Lunacharsky, Martov. The paper appeared from January 29, 1915 to September 15, 1916 (213 issues) when it was suppressed by the French Government.—p. 91.

84. *Riech* (*Speech*)—an important newspaper which appeared in Petersburg from 1906 to 1917 under the editorship of Paul Miliukov. Central organ of the Cadet Party.—p. 93.

85. The reference here is to the manifesto "To All the Peoples of the World" which the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies issued on March 27, 1917. The manifesto stated, among other things:

... In appealing to all the peoples exposed to destruction and ruin by the terrible war, we declare that the time has come to begin a resolute struggle with the predatory aspirations of the governments of all countries, the time has come for the peoples to take the matter of war and peace into their own hands. With the consciousness of its revolutionary power, Russian democracy declares that it will work against the policy of conquest of its ruling classes with every means, and calls upon the peoples of Europe to take common decisive actions in favour of peace. . . . We appeal to our brothers, the proletarians of the Austro-German coalition and primarily to the German proletariat. They made you believe from the first days of the war that when you took up arms against absolutist Russia, you were thereby defending European culture against Asiatic despotism. Many of you saw in that a justification for supporting the war. To-day this justification is lacking: Democratic Russia cannot be a threat to freedom and civilisation. . . . We shall defend our own freedom against all reactionary attempts, whether they come from within or without. The Russian Revolution will not retreat before the bayonets of the conquerors and it will not allow itself to be throttled by an outside military power. But we call upon you: Shake off the yoke of your autocratic order, just as the Russian people has shaken off the tsarist autocracy; refuse to serve as a tool of conquest and violence in the hands of kings, landowners and bankers—and with consolidated, united forces we shall put an end to the terrible carnage which is outraging mankind and darkening the great days of the birth of Russian freedom. . . .—p. 93.

86. The conference of the Bolshevik Fraction of the All-Russian Conference of Soviets took place on April 17, 1917, in the gallery of the Tauride Palace. Lenin repeated his speech the same day to a combined meeting of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. The present text is not a stenographic report, but merely notes of one of the auditors. It is therefore inexact. There are several gaps in the text which are indicated by dots; but in spite of several ambiguous passages, Lenin's train of thought is perfectly clear.—p. 95.

87. *Sotsial-Democrat* (*Social-Democrat*)—this refers to the Moscow party organ of the Bolsheviks which made its appearance there in March, 1917. When the central organ of the party, the *Pravda*, was moved to Moscow in March, 1918, the *Social-Democrat* ceased publication.—p. 96.

88. *Rabochaia Gazeta* (*Workers' Gazette*)—a Menshevik daily paper which appeared in 1917 in Petrograd; the organ of the Organisation Committee of the R.S.-D.L.P. (see note 10).—p. 103.

89. *Novoie Vremia* (*New Times*)—a prominent reactionary daily paper which was published in Petersburg from 1876 to 1917. Under tsarism, it was very influential, having been read chiefly by the bureaucratic circles.—p. 104.

90. *Izvestia* (*News*)—the organ of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, edited more in the spirit of internationalism in March, 1917. At the request of the Executive Committee, however, the composition of the editorial staff was changed and the paper entered upon an open

social-patriotic course. Since the second Soviet Congress on November 7, 1917, the *Izvestia* has become the official organ of the Soviet Government. The paper has been published in Moscow since March, 1918.—p. 104.

91. *Russkaia Volia* (*The Russian Will*)—a daily paper founded in 1916 by Protopopov, member of the Imperial Duma, with the help of the large banks. Protopopov, with the co-operation of the notorious Rasputin, was soon after appointed Minister of the Interior by the Tsar. The *Russkaia Volia* was the reactionary organ of the big bourgeoisie.—p. 104.

92. *Yedinstvo* (*Unity*)—a newspaper published by George Plekhanov in Petrograd in 1917. It followed an extreme social-chauvinist course, preaching victory over Germany and the support of the Provisional Government. The *Yedinstvo* carried on a violent agitation against the Bolsheviks and supported the coalition with the Cadets. Later the *Yedinstvo* group, together with the other bourgeois parties, participated in the counter-revolutionary organisations and exerted its influence in favour of Denikin and Kolchak.—p. 109.

93. On August 4, 1914, the Reichstag Fraction of the Social-Democratic Party voted for the war credits.—p. 110.

94. The All-Russian Conference of Soviets was convened by the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. It met on April 11 in Petrograd and was under the decided influence of the Mensheviks. The Conference voted for the platform of the so-called "revolutionary defencism" and the support of the Provisional Government on the condition that the latter carry out the "Agreement of March 15" (*i. e.*, the agreement between the Provisional Executive Committee of the Imperial Duma and the Executive Committee of the Soviet concerning the formation of the government and its programme, see notes 13 and 34) and that the government be controlled by the Soviet. After a speech by Tsereteli, a resolution was adopted by 325 against 57 votes, with 20 abstaining, in which it was stated, among other things: ". . . The Conference of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies calls upon Russian democracy to mobilise all the vital forces of the country in all spheres of national life in order to reinforce the front and the rear" (of the army in the field).—p. 111.

95. "His Majesty's Opposition"—this refers to the Cadet Party. On the occasion of a visit of a Duma Delegation to England, Miliukov, the leader of the Cadets, declared in London that his party was not in opposition to His Majesty but the "Opposition of His Majesty."—p. 123.

96. The formula of Parvus and Trotsky in 1905 for the organisation of revolutionary power. This formula constitutes the basic principle of the so-called "Theory of the Permanent Revolution," which Lenin subjected to a very severe criticism.—p. 123.

97. See George Plekhanov: *Anarchism and Socialism*. This pamphlet, written originally in German, was published in Berlin in 1894.—p. 125.

98. Kamenev's article "Our Differences," against which Lenin here polemises, will be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 125.

99. Lenin published a collection of his articles in 1908 under the pseudonym of Vl. Ilyin. See Vl. Ilyin: *Twelve Years, Collected Essays*, Vol. I, *Two Tendencies in Russian Marxism and the Russian Social-Democracy* (Russian), Petersburg, 1908.—p. 127.

100. See Engels' letters to Bebel of March 18-28, 1875; first published by Bebel in 1910 in his book *Aus Meinem Leben*, Volume I.—pp. 318-324.

101. See Karl Marx: *The Civil War in France*.—p. 140.

102. *Minoritaires*—the adherents of the minority in the French Socialist Party which represented a social-pacifist standpoint during the war.—p. 147.

103. Independent Labour Party—founded by Keir Hardie, it is a Socialist organisation of centrist tendency, affiliated with the British Labour Party as an autonomous organisation. During the war the I.L.P. maintained a pacifist policy. It left the Second International in 1920 and joined the Vienna Socialist International, the so-called Second and a Half International. Together with the latter, the I.L.P. returned to the Second International in 1923. In 1924, MacDonald, the leader of the I.L.P., headed the "Labour Government" in England for several months.—p. 147.

104. British Socialist Party—before the war, it occupied a Marxist position with a strong sectarian colouring. Its influence upon the masses was therefore very slight and it remained organisationally weak. At the beginning of the war, several of the old leaders deserted to the social-patriots, but were expelled from the party in 1915. The B.S.P. joined the Zimmerwald Union. In 1920 the B.S.P., together with several other revolutionary political labour groups, organised the Communist Party of England.—p. 147.

105. The American Socialist Party, far from being a revolutionary Marxist party, was permeated by reformism even before the World War and the Russian Revolution. Its opposition to the war, the ratification of the Zimmerwald Manifesto, as well as its various anti-war proclamations during this period were essentially pacifist rather than revolutionary in nature. The party, however, had large numbers of proletarian revolutionary elements, and, influenced by the March Revolution and the crystallisation of the revolutionary internationalist groups in Europe, it adopted a militant anti-war manifesto at its convention in St. Louis in April, 1917, immediately upon America's entrance into the war. The call to revolutionary action embodied in this manifesto, however, was soon emasculated by the party leadership, and the November Revolution stimulated the formation of Left groups within the party. The final crystallisation of an organised Left Wing led to a split and the formation of the Communist Party in 1919. Since then, with the loss of its proletarian base and mass contact, the Socialist Party has developed into an open petty-bourgeois reformist party, eliminating the prin-

ciple of class struggle from its platform and aspiring to become the "third" party of American capitalism.—p. 149.

106. The "Narrow-Minded"—this was what the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Bulgaria, which occupied a revolutionary position already before the war, called itself in contradistinction to the reformists, the so-called "Broad-Minded." It was founded by Blagoev, who as a student in Russia during the eighties organised Socialist groups there. During the war, the "Narrow-Minded" assumed a decidedly internationalist standpoint. With the formation of the Third International, under the leadership of Kolarov and others, they were among the first to join it and organised the Communist Party of Bulgaria.—p. 149.

107. See the "Farewell Letter to the Swiss Workers" (p. 82), where Lenin reports in more detail concerning the co-operation of the Bolsheviks with this Left group of Swiss Socialists.—p. 150.

108. The *Volksstimme* (*People's Voice*) supported the social-patriotic policy of the leadership of the German Social-Democratic Party during the war.—p. 151.

109. *Confédération Générale du Travail* (General Confederation of Labour)—the general organisation of the French trade unions. Before the war it maintained a militant syndicalist policy; since the war it has been openly reformist and class collaborationist under the leadership of its president, Jouhaux. The revolutionary unions which belong to the Red Trade Union International (R.I.L.U.) are organised in the *Confédération Générale du Travail Unitaire* (C.G.T.U.).—p. 151.

110. *Die Jugendinternationale* (*The Youth International*)—an internationalist journal published by Willi Münzenberg (now a Communist member of the Reichstag) in Zürich from 1915 to 1918. The journal was distributed illegally in the belligerent countries.—p. 152.

111. In 1916, during the war, L. D. Trotsky was expelled from France and then from Spain because of internationalist propaganda. He then came to New York where he edited the Russian Socialist newspaper *Novy Mir* (*The New World*). On May 3, 1917, on his way to Russia after the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, Trotsky was arrested in Canada together with a few other Russian political emigrants, and interned in a concentration camp at Halifax as "a political fugitive dangerous to the Allies." His arrest lasted about a month. He was freed and allowed to proceed to Russia after a protest by the Petrograd Soviet to the Provisional Government.—p. 153.

112. Martov and a group of internationalist Mensheviks who were living in Switzerland wished to return to Russia by water via England. But the English Government refused visas to them. After having refused at first to go with Lenin through Germany, they were later compelled to use the same route.—p. 153.

113. This refers to the so-called "Liberty Loan of 1917," an internal loan which the Provisional Government had levied for war purposes. All political parties, from the Rights to the Mensheviks, supported this loan. The Bolsheviks agitated against the loan and declared that support of it was equal to the granting of war credits. The loan was unsuccessful, the greatest number of the bonds remaining with the banks.—p. 154.

114. The Gotha Programme was adopted at the Unity Congress which was held in Gotha in May, 1875. At this Congress the Lassallean and Eisenach (Marxist) Fractions united to form the Socialist Workers' Party of Germany. The programme was a compromise between the Lassallean and Eisenach groups, containing all the essentially un-Marxian principles of Lassalle: the iron law of wages, the right of the workers to the whole product of their labour, establishment of Socialist producers' co-operatives with state aid; in addition, all classes outside of the workers were declared to constitute a reactionary mass. In his *Gotha Programme*, Marx subjected this compromise programme to annihilating criticism. The Gotha Programme remained the official party programme until 1891, when it was replaced by the Erfurt Programme adopted at the Congress held at Erfurt that year.—p. 154.

115. The original pamphlet *Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat*, which appeared after a long delay, contains the following note under the title and before the text, probably made by Lenin himself as he read the final proofs: "Explanation of the draft of a platform which N. Lenin wrote for the discussion at the conferences of Bolsheviks. The publication of the draft itself was delayed solely because of lack of print shops in Petrograd."—p. 158.

116. See the telegram of the Minister of Agriculture, Shingarev, to the Ranenburg County Committee, p. 192 of this book.—p. 164.

117. On the Kamenno-ostrovsky Prospect there used to be the palace of Kshesinskaia, a ballet dancer and former mistress of Tsar Nicholas II who had the palace built for her. During the March Revolution, the palace was occupied by an armoured car division and placed at the disposal of the Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee of the Bolsheviks. In addition to these, several trade union bureaus also had their headquarters there. The large hall of the palace served as a reading room and soldiers' club. Kshesinskaia repeatedly tried to drive out the Bolshevik organisations with the help of the judicial offices of the Provisional Government, but without success.—p. 171.

118. In the declaration of the Provisional Government on the war issued April 9, 1917, it was said:

... The defence of our native land at any price and the liberation of the country from the enemy who has broken across our boundaries—that is the first urgent, vital task of our warriors who are defending the freedom of the people. . . . The goal of free Russia is not the domination over other peoples, not the rape of their national territory, not the violent conquest of foreign territories, but the establishment of a permanent peace on the basis of the

right of self-determination of peoples. . . . These principles will be made the basis of the foreign policy of the Provisional Government, which is unswervingly carrying out the will of the people and protecting the rights of our fatherland, while fully preserving the obligations assumed towards our allies. . . .

The declaration was published under the pressure of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies which had demanded that the Provisional Government publish its war aims and adopt the proclamation of the Soviet of March 27 (see note 85). The Provisional Government adopted the revolutionary phraseology of that proclamation, but emphasised most decidedly its loyalty to the treaties with the Allies.—p. 173.

119. The London Agreement was concluded by the powers of the Entente on September 6, 1914. According to this Agreement, the contracting parties were forbidden to end the war separately and could declare peace only jointly with the other Allies.—p. 173.

120. The Congress of the Delegates of the Field Army and the Western Front took place in Minsk on April 20, 1917, and was composed as follows: 850 delegates with a deciding vote, 350 with an advisory vote and about 100 guests. There were a large number of officers among the delegates. The Bolshevik Posern was elected chairman. Greetings were delivered by General Gurko of the General Staff, Rodzianko and Rodichev of the Imperial Duma, and Chkhheidze of the Petrograd Soviet. The Central Committee of the Bolsheviks was represented by Nogin and Lashevich. The majority of the Congress followed the line of the Petrograd Soviet and the resolutions adopted there represented a compromise.—p. 174.

121. Plekhanov's article entitled "On Lenin's Theses and Why Deliriums Are Occasionally Interesting" was published in Numbers 9, 10 and 11 of the *Yedinstvo*, being devoted to a criticism of Lenin's theses of April 17. After presenting Lenin's first thesis, Plekhanov writes: "And what about Germany? Lenin says nothing about that. It would appear that Germany has been exposed to the danger of being plundered by Russia and that the Russian proletariat need not participate in the present war."—p. 176.

122. The *Modern* was a circus in Petrograd, where mass meetings were held in 1917.—p. 178.

123. This refers to the speech which Lenin delivered the day after his arrival in Russia, in which he elucidated his April Theses (see note 86).—p. 178.

124. *Dielo Naroda* (*People's Cause*)—daily paper, and organ of the Central Committee of the Party of Socialists-Revolutionists which appeared in Petrograd in 1917. The paper stood for defencism and represented the views of the so-called "Chernov Centre" in contrast to the *Volia Naroda* (see note 142) which was the organ of the "Right" Wing of the party. With the "freedom" of political opinions prevalent in the Socialist-Revolutionist Party

and the variety of political "tendencies," several papers appeared simultaneously in Petrograd, each of which represented a different "tendency."—p. 180.

125. The article referred to appeared in Number 23 of the *Dielo Naroda*, April 26, 1917, under the title: "Diplomatic Silence and Warlike Speeches." The author of the article draws attention to the fact that the question had been directed at the Provisional Government whether it had communicated its statement concerning its renunciation of the policy of annexations and indemnities to the Allied Governments in the customary form of a diplomatic note. Several members of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to be sure, had declared that such a note had been sent and that a reply had even been received. In reality, however—the author continues—on the authority of competent sources, no note had been sent. Meanwhile Minister of War Guchkov is continuing to deliver belligerent speeches in which he calls upon the army to destroy Austria and Germany completely.—p. 182.

126. The Proclamation "To the Soldiers and Sailors" was written by Lenin after April 24, 1917. The manuscript was found among his papers. This proclamation was not published at the time. Instead, another proclamation appeared in the *Pravda* entitled: "Against the Pogrom Makers" (p. 186).—p. 183.

127. The report was published in Number 32 of the *Izvestia*, April 18, 1917.—p. 184.

128. The protest of the Petrograd Soviet against the arrest of Trotsky, Melnichansky and other internationalists upon their return journey from America to Russia by the English Government in Canada (see note 111) is reproduced in Number 36 of the Petrograd *Izvestia*. The letter by Zurabov, a Left Menshevik and former Deputy in the Second Imperial Duma, stated that the Minister of Foreign Affairs Miliukov instructed the Russian consuls abroad not to grant passports to the emigrant internationalists who were blacklisted (see note 81). Martov's telegram was published in Number 37 of the *Izvestia*, April 24, 1917.—p. 184.

129. The proclamation "Against the Pogrom Makers" is the revised form of the proclamation "To the Soldiers and Sailors" (see note 126). It was written by Lenin on April 27, 1917 and proposed the same day to the Petrograd City Conference which accepted it. The following day the proclamation appeared in the *Pravda* signed by the Central Committee and the Petrograd Committee of the party.—p. 186.

130. *Malenkaia Gazeta* (*Little Gazette*)—a Petrograd boulevard paper which appeared from 1915 to 1917. It was published by A. Suvorin, Jr., the son of the publisher of the *Novoe Vremia* (see note 89). In 1917 the paper added the subtitle: *Newspaper of Non-Partisan Socialists*.—p. 193.

131. The Petrograd City Conference of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (Bolsheviks) took place on April 27 to May 5, 1917, with

the interruption of a few days caused by the "April Crisis" (see note 150). Fifty-seven delegates with deciding votes participated in the Conference. G. Zinoviev was chairman. The agenda included the following points: 1. Political situation (Reporter: Lenin); 2. Attitude towards the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and its reorganisation; 3. Building up the organisation; 4. Attitude towards Social-Democrats of other tendencies; 5. Municipal elections; 6. The attack upon the *Pravda*. Lenin's speech at the Conference on the political situation aroused the interest of the government officials of the Provisional Government. Among the documents of the judicial investigator of the Petrograd court, Alexandrov, who conducted the investigation concerning the July events, there are numerous quotations from Lenin's report, particularly those passages which refer to the question of the immediate seizure of landed estates, the structure of the state and criticism of defencism. Lenin's speeches are reproduced here according to the minutes of the Petrograd City Conference.—p. 197.

132. Lenin's speech at the Petrograd City Conference gave rise to a lengthy discussion in which Tomsky, Stahl, Yakovlev, Safarov, Bogdatiev, Kalinin and others participated. The next day the written resolution on the attitude towards the Provisional Government was made public. On this resolution Lenin (twice) and Kamenev spoke, the latter proposing various changes. (See note 134.)—p. 205.

133. A commission was elected by the Conference for the purpose of drafting the resolution on the policy towards the Provisional Government; it consisted of Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin, Bogdatiev and Shutko. The present resolution, therefore, is a collective product. However, since the resolution was written under the leadership and with the direct co-operation of Lenin, it has been embodied in the collection of Lenin's writings.—p. 207.

134. Kamenev proposed the inclusion of a sentence in the resolution on the control of the Provisional Government by the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and to exclude from point five of the resolution the enumeration of the "sins" of the Provisional Government. Only Kamenev's proposed change in point five—the words "monarchist agitation" were replaced by the words "counter-revolutionary agitation"—was adopted by the Conference. The record of Lenin's speech in the minutes has many gaps.—p. 209.

135. The "Draft Resolution on the War" was proposed by Lenin on April 29, 1917, in the commission elected by the Conference. Lenin proposed the same draft to the editorial commission of the All-Russian April (May) Conference. There the resolution was essentially revised and then adopted by the Conference. The minutes of the Petrograd City Conference do not give the text of this draft, although Lenin declares expressly in his speech at the April Conference on the Resolution on the War, that he has also read the original draft of the resolution at the City Conference. The text of the resolution has been preserved in typewritten form and is now in the archives of the Lenin Institute.—p. 209.

136. The speaker on the question of Municipal Elections was L. M. Mikhailov, who expressed himself for a bloc with the other Socialist parties and for a common municipal programme. The speaker asserted that in this question there were no differences between the Bolsheviks and the other Socialist parties, and that a bloc was necessary for a more effective struggle against the Cadets. Mikhailov's municipal programme, which was published in Number 46 of the Petrograd *Izvestia* without the author's signature, stresses the importance of municipal self-government as the "germ of collective society" and quoting the decisions of the International Socialist Congress at Paris of 1900, offers a general democratic programme of municipal reform. Mikhailov's speech evoked a lively discussion in which Lenin also participated twice. The Conference rejected all blocs, decided that in municipal elections not only municipal demands but also demands of a general political nature were to be set up, and adopted the resolution proposed by Lenin.—p. 214.

137. *International*—journal of a group of internationalists led by Larin. Lenin was very suspicious of Larin's internationalism at the beginning of 1917, Larin having been a former Menshevik and "Liquidator." Larin, however, had completely broken with the Mensheviks and, together with his group, joined the Bolshevik Party in August, 1917.—p. 214.

138. The Resolution of the Petrograd City Conference on the Municipal Question is reproduced in the first part of the seventh volume of G. Zinoviev's *Collected Works*. However, the minutes of the Petrograd City Conference record the following:

Three resolutions on the Municipal Question are read and voted upon:
Resolution of Comrade Mikhailov —For 1, Against 18, Abstained 4
" " " Sergei — " 2, " 13, " 8
" " " Lenin — " 21, " 0, " 2

The resolution of Comrade Lenin is adopted.

In Number 40 of the *Pravda*, May 8, 1917, it is also reported that Lenin's resolution on the Municipal Question was adopted. For this reason, it was decided to include the resolution among Lenin's writings.—p. 215.

139. The conference of the representatives of the peasant organisations and of the Soviets of Peasants' Deputies took place in Petrograd in the Tauride Palace on April 27, 1917. It occupied itself with the preparatory work of convening an All-Russian Congress of Peasants' Soviets and determined the rules for representation at the Congress. More than twenty provinces were represented at the conference.—p. 219.

140. *Finansovaia Gazeta* (*Financial Gazette*)—a daily paper founded by V. V. Protopopov in Petrograd in 1915; organ of the big capitalists and bankers. Appeared first as an evening paper, later as a weekly.—p. 227.

141. *Zemlia i Volia* (*Land and Freedom*)—a Socialist-Revolutionist daily paper, organ of the Petrograd Committee of the party, which was published in Petrograd in 1917.—p. 227.

142. *Volia Naroda* (*People's Will*)—a daily paper which was published in Petrograd in 1917; organ of the Right Wing of the Socialist-Revolutionist Party. The paper followed an outright social-patriotic and social-chauvinist course.—p. 227.

143. *Dien* (*Day*)—a Petrograd daily paper. Founded in 1912 with the financial support of the banks, it was in the hands of the Menshevik Liquidators. In 1917, the paper bore the sub-title: *Organ of Socialist Thought*, but it was in reality the organ of the Left Wing of the liberal bourgeoisie. A. Potresov was editor-in-chief.—p. 227.

144. The Kanavin correspondence, published in Number 32 of the *Pravda*, April 27, 1917, and signed "Levit," stated:

In this district there are sixteen factories with about 30,000 workers, the railroaders not included. An illegal organisation has existed for some time. . . . In almost every factory there has been introduced a labour militia paid by the factory management. To the Provincial Commissar as well as to the Chief for the Protection of the City have been attached committees of three delegates each, among them one representative of the City Duma and one representative of the Soviet. On March 27, a new executive committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies was elected, a large part of which consists of Bolshevik workers.—p. 229.

145. The note of May 1, 1917, which the Minister of Foreign Affairs Miliukov communicated to the Allied Governments through the Russian diplomatic representatives abroad together with the Declaration of the Provisional Government of March 27, defined this declaration more precisely and emphasised the determined will of the Provisional Government to carry the war to a victorious end and to remain loyal to the treaties with the Allies.

The declarations of the Provisional Government permeated by the new spirit of liberated democracy—Miliukov wrote in this note—naturally cannot offer the slightest cause to assume that the accomplished upheaval will result in a weakening of Russia's rôle in the common struggle of the Allies. Quite the contrary. The effort of the whole people to carry the World War through to a decisive victory has only been strengthened thanks to the recognition of the general responsibility of each individual. This effort has become more active since it concentrates upon a task which is real and close to every one's heart—to beat back the enemy who has broken across the very boundaries of our fatherland itself. Naturally, the Provisional Government—as is also expressed in the accompanying document [the declaration of the Provisional Government.—*Ed.*]—in protecting the rights of our fatherland, will hold faithfully to the obligations which we have assumed towards our allies. While the government is now, as before, firmly convinced that the present war will be victoriously concluded in complete accord with the Allies, it also maintains the full conviction that the problems raised by this war will be solved in the spirit of the creation of a firm basis for an enduring peace and that the progressive democracies permeated by the same aspirations will find a means to achieve those guarantees and sanctions which are necessary to prevent new bloody conflicts in the future.—p. 233.

146. Point seven of the Resolution of the Petrograd City Conference of the Bolsheviks on the attitude towards the Provisional Government states that ". . . each step made by the Provisional Government both in the realm of its

domestic and foreign policies, is bound to open the eyes not only of the city and village proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also of the petty bourgeoisie to the real nature of this government." (See page 208 of this book.)—p. 235.

147. Number 18 of the *Yedinstvo* of May 3, 1917, published a letter by Plekhanov to the students. Plekhanov, who was prevented by illness from being present in person at the May 1 meeting, sent the following letter to the "organiser of the meeting," the association of Socialist students:

Dear Comrades! I am very sorry that illness—not for long, I hope—prevents me from expressing my sympathies in person. But it is entirely impossible. I am forced to confine myself to a written communication to you. It is very important for the emancipation movement of the international proletariat that as many college-trained people as possible join it. Education helps one to get oriented in phenomena and to evaluate them historically. Since, in your persons, I am writing to people who are working at their education, I permit myself to draw your attention to the following noteworthy circumstance. The decision to celebrate the first of May was made at the Paris International Socialist Congress in 1889. At this Congress there were representatives of many capitalist countries which already at that time stood on a higher level of economic development than that which Russia has now attained. The Anarchists proposed to the Congress to call upon the proletariat to make a social revolution. The Congress, the majority of which consisted of Marxists, called upon the proletariat to fight for the eight-hour day. It understood that the social, more precisely, the Socialist revolution presupposes a long labour of enlightenment and organisation in the depths of the working class. That is now forgotten by the people here who call upon the Russian toiling masses to seize political power, a call which could have any meaning only if the objective conditions were present which are necessary for the social revolution. These conditions do not as yet exist, and you, who are familiar with scientific method, should remind those who should know it as often as possible. The task of the Left parties in Russia consists in fortifying the positions which have been won by the revolution which has been just brought about. For a solution of this task it is necessary not to overthrow the Provisional Government as a few political fanatics would like to do, but unanimously to support it. G. Plekhanov.—p. 236.

148. *Novaia Zhizn* (*New Life*)—organ of the Social-Democratic Internationalists, published by Maxim Gorki in Petrograd in 1917. Besides Gorki, N. Sukhanov, V. Stroiev, I. Serebrov also belonged to the editorial staff. The following were announced as collaborators: B. Avilov, V. Bazarov, A. Bogdanov, V. Briusov, V. Kerzhentsev, L. Krassin, N. Krestinsky, A. Lozovsky, A. Lunacharsky, L. Martov, Ramsay MacDonald, V. Maiakovsky, M. Pavlovich, M. Pokrovsky, Larissa Reissner, Romain Rolland, A. Swidersky, Philip Snowden, J. Steklov, K. Timiriazev, A. N. Tolstoy, Uritsky, H. G. Wells and others. Up to November, the *Novaia Zhizn* vacillated continually between social-pacifism and revolution; now it attacked the Provisional Government and the compromisers, now the Bolsheviks. The November Revolution inspired the organ of the intellectuals, which had no influence among the masses, with fear, and the people of the *Novaia Zhizn* turned sharply against the Soviets. Some sank to the level of open Menshevism, others withdrew from political life entirely. The former Bolsheviks and the so-called Mezhraiontsy (see note 206) returned to the Bolshevik Party. A small group of the supporters of the *Novaia Zhizn* joined the Moscow organisation of the Social-Democratic in-

ternationalists after Moscow was made the capital. This group existed up to 1919 when it merged with the Communist Party.—p. 240.

149. In Number 26 of the *Dielo Naroda* (April 29, 1917), V. Chernov published an article entitled "Lenin." "Lenin," Chernov said, "is a man of great capacities, but the abnormal conditions of underground life have dwarfed and stunted them most gruesomely. Lenin could say of himself: 'I know not where I am going, but I am going there with determination.' Lenin is certainly devoted to the revolution, but with him this devotion is embodied in his own person: 'I am the state.' [The expression *l'état, c'est moi*, attributed to Louis XIV.—*Ed.*] To him there is no difference between personal policy and the interests of the party, the interests of Socialism. Lenin has an extraordinary intellect, but it is one-sided. Lenin is an absolutely honest man, but a man with a one-track mind. For that reason his moral sense has been dulled. Lenin's Socialism is a blunt Socialism; he uses a big axe where a scalpel is needed." The fear that Lenin might disrupt Russian life appears ludicrous to Chernov. If Lenin's programme is analysed, there is seen above all an intoxication with the air of the revolution and a dizziness as a result of the enormous height to which events have whisked him. He lacks a sense of responsibility. Chernov therefore finds that the danger of Lenin's influence is very limited and can easily be localised by "us—the Socialists."—p. 242.

150. The crisis of May 3-5, 1917, was caused by Minister of Foreign Affairs Miliukov's note to the Allied Governments (see note 145) of May 1. This note convinced the toiling masses that the Provisional Government which in words accepted the slogan of peace without annexations or indemnities, but in reality confirmed its faithfulness to the annexationist treaties concluded by Nicholas II with the Allies and bound itself to carry the war to a victorious end. The result was a series of street demonstrations of the workers and soldiers against Miliukov and the Provisional Government. The bourgeoisie replied with patriotic counter-demonstrations which led to outbreaks on the Nevsky Prospect. Demonstrating workers were fired upon. The movement found an echo in Moscow where a part of the workers and the 56th Reserve Regiment demonstrated before the Soviet and the Moscow Committee of the Bolsheviks. The indignation of the masses compelled Miliukov to retire. He was replaced by Tereshchenko, up to that time Minister of Finance. The government crisis persisted until May 5 when the first Coalition Government was formed with the participation of the Socialists. The resolutions of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks of May 4 and 5, 1917, were written by Lenin. A previous resolution of May 3 was probably written by another member of the Central Committee. It will be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 245.

151. The leading article of the *Rabochiaia Gazeta*, Number 36, May 4, 1917, entitled "An Insane Step," and devoted to the crisis of May 3, stated:

Russian Democracy looked upon the proclamation of the Provisional Government to the citizens on April 9 [see note 118] only as a first step; it expected a second step—the proposal to the allied republics [?—*Ed.*] to

subject the old treaties to revision from the standpoint of the new principles proclaimed on April 9. Now the Minister of Foreign Affairs declares that no new principles had been proclaimed on April 9, that it [the Provisional Government.—*Ed.*] "had only added its voice to the voices of its allies." . . . All nations and, above all, Russian Democracy are interested in the cessation of the carnage, and our Democracy will offer decided opposition to the move of the Provisional Government. We have turned decidedly against stirring up civil war by the supporters of Lenin. But now it is no longer Lenin's supporters who are giving the signal for civil war, but the Provisional Government which has published a document which is a mockery of the aspirations of Democracy. It is truly an insane step and immediate determined measures on the part of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are necessary to prevent its frightful consequences.—p. 251.

152. *Gazeta-Kopeika* (*Penny Gazette*)—a bourgeois daily of small format and sold at one kopeck which appeared in Petrograd from 1908 to 1917. It was published by M. Gorodetsky.—p. 253.

153. *Birzhevy Viedomosti* (*Stock Exchange News*)—a boulevard paper published daily in two editions in Petrograd. It was usually called *Birzhevka* for short.—p. 260.

154. As a result of the events of May 3-5 in Petrograd, the *Yedinstvo* of May 5, 1917 (Number 20), published the following proclamation on its first page in large type:

Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party. Proletarians of all countries, unite! Proclamation. Citizens! Our Fatherland is in danger! We do not need a civil war! A civil war will destroy our young freedom. What is necessary is an understanding between the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies and the Provisional Government. We do not need any conquests, but we must not permit Germany to enslave Russia. Each people has the right to determine its own destiny. Wilhelm of Germany and Karl of Austria will never agree to this. By conducting the war against them, we are defending our own and others' freedom. Russia cannot be unfaithful to its Allies. That would cover the country with shame and would call down upon it the righteous anger and the scorn of the entire Democratic Europe.—G. V. Plekhanov, L. G. Deutsch, V. I. Zasulich.—p. 262.

155. Torinainen's interview with Lenin was published in the Helsingfors Finnish Social-Democratic paper *Työmies* (*Worker*) of May 8, 1917. The following note was added by the reporter:

I met Comrade Lenin, of whom so much is being spoken in the last few days, in the editorial office of the *Pravda*. Not having any time, Lenin said he could only have a short conversation. Upon my question, however, he replied as follows. . . .

In the Russian edition the interview was re-translated from the Finnish. The English translation is made from the Russian.—p. 264.

156. In Number 38 of the *Rabochaia Gazeta* an article appeared entitled "The Non-Commissioned Officer's Widow" containing a criticism of the resolution of the Bolshevik Central Committee "On the Provisional Government in Connection with the Crisis of Power." The author of the article is of the opinion that the Leninists have lost their courage in face of the elemental anarchy which they themselves have laboured to stir up.

The Bolsheviks were afraid of power. . . . The Leninists were afraid of the resistance which they encountered in the embittered mass of bourgeois philistines. . . . To us it has always been clear that demagogic is inseparably

bound up with the absence of principle and political cowardice. . . . That, we hope, should become clear to many now. . . .—p. 265.

157. The expression "attempt to move slightly more to the Left" refers to the tactics of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolsheviks which had issued the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government!" in the April Days. Further details are given in the "Concluding Remarks in Connection with the Report on the Political Situation" delivered at the April Conference (p. 285 of this book).—p. 265.

158. The "Draft of Theses for a Resolution on the Soviets" was written by Lenin during the April Conference. The theses served as a basis for his speech at the Conference on May 8, which, however, were not preserved in the minutes of the Conference. They contain, particularly in the conclusion, only suggestive phrases, but no finished formulations. This is sufficiently explained by the origin and purpose of these written notes.—p. 267.

159. The All-Russian April Conference of the Bolsheviks met in Petrograd from April 24 to 29 (May 7-12). From the character of the questions treated there, as well as from the importance which it assumed for the further development of the entire Russian Revolution, and the fact that a new Central Committee was elected at this Conference, the Conference was really a party convention. The agenda included the following important points: The Political Situation (Evaluation of the Perspectives of the Russian Revolution), the War, Preparatory Work for the Formation of the Third International, the Agrarian Question, the Programme Question and the National Question. There were 151 delegates at the Conference, representing 79,204 party members, in spite of the fact that since the March Revolution, when the party emerged from its underground existence, only two months had elapsed.

At the Conference there was a small group, consisting predominantly of a part of the delegates of the Moscow Committee and the Moscow District Organisation (Nogin, Rykov, Smidovich, Ovsianikov, Angarsky and others); their conception of the revolution corresponded to the position of the Bolsheviks in 1905 (the formula: "Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Peasantry"). At the Moscow City Conference which had taken place shortly before, resolutions were adopted which almost completely expressed the conceptions of 1905. (The "Resolution of the Muscovites," of which Lenin speaks in his report, was not the resolution of the Moscow City Conference but of the Conference of the Moscow District; this resolution will be found among the appendices in Book II.) Kamenev, who stood close to the conceptions of this group, was delegated by it to deliver a co-report.

A "Left" standpoint was also represented. This was supported by the Moscow District Committee of which Bubnov, Oppokov (Lomov) and Sokolnikov were delegates.

The Polish delegates with Felix Dzierzynski at the head assumed a special position on the National Question. The Polish comrades, who were accustomed to struggle against Polish nationalism, considered the resolution which announced the right of self-determination of peoples to the point of recognising the right of separating from Russia as untenable and opportunistic. Piatakov

was also in disagreement with Lenin's views on the National Question. These debates constituted a continuation of the discussion which had occupied the party since 1913.

There were big debates in the commissions. In the Commission for the Revision of the Party Programme, the comrades of the Moscow District Committee (Oppokov) proposed to revise the theoretical part of the programme, to which Lenin did not agree. In the Commission on the International the majority of the members considered it possible to build up the Third International not only from the elements of the Zimmerwald Left but from the elements of Zimmerwald and Kienthal in general. The Commission made certain changes in the resolution presented by Zinoviev which were later rejected by the Plenum. On the other hand, there were differences between Lenin and Zinoviev on this question. Lenin insisted that it was necessary to break immediately with the Zimmerwald Union, remaining in it only for "purposes of information." Following the discussion, the Conference accepted Zinoviev's view.

The Conference was preceded by a session on May 6 of the delegates who reached Petrograd by that time. In this session the agenda of the Conference was agreed upon.

The minutes of the Conference were not conducted systematically. Part of them are stenographic, full of gaps and errors, part are written records. Only a few stylistic and grammatical corrections were made in these minutes. The resolutions adopted by the Conference were prepared by a commission elected at the Conference and with Lenin's direct co-operation. The resolutions as well as the "Proclamation to the Soldiers of All Countries" will be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 269.

160. *Soldatskaia Pravda* (*Soldier's Truth*)—a popular daily paper of the Petrograd Military Organization of the Bolsheviks which was published from April 28 till the July Days of 1917.—p. 272.

161. The resolution referred to here, which Lenin proposed to the April Conference, has been lost to this day.—p. 282.

162. The Erfurt Programme of the German Social-Democracy was adopted at the Party Convention in Erfurt, October 14-20, 1891, in place of the antiquated Gotha Programme (see note 114); it was written by Kautsky who later published an extensive commentary on this programme. The Erfurt Programme consists of two parts: 1. A presentation of the Marxian theory concerning the development of society from capitalism to Socialism (the so-called Maximum Programme); 2. It contains a series of practical demands which can be carried out within the framework of capitalist society (Minimum Programme). The Erfurt Programme served as a model for a number of programmes of the other national Social-Democratic parties of the Second International, including the Programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party of 1903.

Friedrich Engels subjected the Erfurt Programme to a lengthy criticism. In reference to the planlessness of production with the existence of trusts, Engels says:

And when we pass from stock companies to trusts which dominate and monopolise whole branches of industry, not only does private production cease, but also planlessness. (See the *Neue Zeit*, 1901-1902, V. I, p. 8).—p. 282.

163. In his co-report at the April (May) Conference, Kamenev said the following concerning the tactics of the party during the events of May 3-5:

... After the Central Committee, in yesterday's resolution, was compelled to admit that the slogan of the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government was an adventurist slogan, which in my opinion is strongly exaggerated, and due to the fact that my statement that the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government" might play a disorganising rôle was ignored—we were forced suddenly to retreat, we missed the time to warn the masses against the disorganising significance of this slogan, and exposed ourselves to the fire of the petty bourgeoisie by saying that this slogan was an adventurist one.

At the end of his speech Kamenev agreed to the demand proposed by the members of the Moscow District Committee and criticised by Lenin of the actual control of the Provisional Government by the Workers' Soviet, and said the following:

... This control was realised when, upon Kornilov's order, the troops were to march out, and the Soviet at that time declared that the troops of the Petrograd Garrison were only at the disposal of the Soviet and the troops did not obey Kornilov's command.—p. 285.

164. Members of the Petrograd Committee (P.C.) of the Bolsheviks which issued a wrong slogan during the events of May 3-5 and did not guide itself by the instructions of the Central Committee.—p. 287.

165. Borgbjerg, member of the Danish Social-Democratic Party, and an opportunist, came to Petrograd in April, 1917, and transmitted an invitation in the name of the Scandinavian Socialists to an international conference which was to meet in Stockholm in order to exercise pressure upon the belligerent countries in the interest of peace. The Mensheviks and the Socialists-Revolutionists accepted the invitation. The German "Spartacists" joined with the Bolsheviks. The social-patriotic Socialist Party of France as well as the English Independent Labour Party finally declined after a long period of vacillation for social-patriotic reasons. The conference did not materialise. The question of calling an international Socialist conference was put on the agenda at the April Conference on Nogin's proposal, the latter having reported at length on Borgbjerg's invitation which Borgbjerg had personally extended at a session of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet. Nogin raised the question for discussion whether the Bolsheviks in one form or other should participate in the international conference planned by Borgbjerg. Nogin himself inclined to the opinion that a delegation of the revolutionary minority of the Soviets be sent abroad if only for purposes of information. The April Conference rejected Nogin's standpoint decidedly.—p. 287.

166. *Social-Demokraten*—chief organ of the Danish Social-Democratic Party, published at Copenhagen.—p. 288.

167. The draft of the resolution on Borgbjerg's proposal which Lenin pre-

sented to the April Conference has not yet been found. It may be assumed that the draft had the same contents as the resolution edited by the commission and accepted by the conference. (See appendices in Book II.)—p. 289.

168. Kamenev's draft resolution on Borgbjerg's proposal is missing from the minutes of the Conference. In his speech, Kamenev proposed that Lenin's resolution be accepted and published as the Manifesto of the Conference, but that in addition a special resolution be adopted, the contents of which amounted to the following:

1. For the unification of the actions of the labouring masses an agreement is to be made only with those parties that admit only of the revolutionary method of struggle against their own imperialism; 2. Without previous understanding with these groups our party considers negotiations with the majorities inadmissible; 3. Exposure of the true character of the proposed conference; to warn the Soviet against participation in this conference; 4. A conference of the revolutionary Social-Democracy is to be organised in opposition to European imperialism.—p. 291.

169. The debates at the April Conference on the attitude toward the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies are missing from the minutes of the conference published by the *Istpart* (Commission for the Study of the History of the Party and the Revolution.) Only the beginning of the report of Nogin, who was vice-chairman of the Moscow Soviet at that time, has been preserved. Lenin's speech is missing entirely and is reproduced here from the short report in the *Pravda*. The *Pravda* Number 42, reported as follows concerning the discussion:

In the evening session of April 25 [May 8], the questions of the stand toward the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was discussed. The discussion was especially valuable because both the rich experience of the local activity of the party organisations and nuclei and of the Soviets was utilised. Comrade Nogin, as the reporter, recommended a cautious stand toward the workers' Soviets. They must be fortified, broad masses attracted to them, their authority strengthened in the eyes of the people. This can only occur by the gradual execution of practical measures. As long as this organisational and political preparatory work is not done, it is premature to declare the Soviets as organs of power. The discussion revealed that in the province the Soviets are much more firmly entrenched than in the centres, their range of activity being considerably greater there than in the capitals. In many places the food distribution is in the hands of the Soviets. They are the real power in the province. In part, they also exercise control over production and distribution.

(Then follows the brief report of Lenin's speech which is printed in the text.)—p. 291.

170. The Resolution of the April Conference on the War is the collective work of the editorial commission in which Lenin participated. It was worked out in accord with his basic report. The commission completed its work on May 10 and Lenin delivered the speech in favour of the resolution as the reporter for the commission. (The resolution on the war as well as the other resolutions of the April Conference will be found among the appendices in Book II.)—p. 291.

171. See V. I. Lenin: *The Agrarian Programme of the Social-Democracy in the First Russian Revolution, 1905-1907* (Russian). The first edition of the book appeared in 1918.—p. 303.

172. Angarsky, who participated in the discussion following Lenin's report on the agrarian question, declared that he was completely in accord with Lenin on the nationalisation of the land, but raised the objection that Lenin, by referring to the *wish* of the peasants themselves for nationalisation, rested his thesis on nationalisation on idealist grounds ("Draft of the 104"). Angarsky was of the opinion that this was impermissible for a Marxist, it being a Socialist-Revolutionist manner of approaching a question.—p. 307.

173. The programme of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party which had been adopted at the Second Congress in 1903, had become antiquated by the time of the second Russian Revolution. Already in his April Theses Lenin declared that it was necessary to revise the programme and change the name of the party (see p. 108 of this book). At the All-Russian April Conference this question was taken up in a commission with the co-operation of Lenin. As material for the Conference, Lenin had copies of his draft of "Proposed Changes in the Theoretical, Political and Several Other Parts of the Programme" (see p. 332) distributed among the delegates. Lack of time, and the fact that no discussion had been conducted on the matter in the party before, moved the Conference to refrain from undertaking a final revision of the programme. The programme commission confined itself to formulating a number of isolated changes (it is with the remarks of the Commission that Lenin takes issue (see pp. 330-331 of this book); the remarks themselves will be found among the appendices in Book II). The Sub-Commission appointed by the Commission for Labour Protection had also worked out a draft revising the economic minimum programme. On the basis of Lenin's report, which he delivered as the reporter for the Sub-Commission, the Conference adopted a general resolution on the necessity of changing the programme and called upon the membership to discuss this question in detail.—p. 308.

174. The reporter on the National Question at the April Conference was J. V. Stalin, who held the same views on the question as were later formulated in the Programme of the Communist Party of Russia at its Eighth Congress. He summarised his speech with the following policies:

Recognition of the right of peoples to separate; territorial autonomy for those peoples that remain within the borders of a given state; special laws for national minorities which will permit them free development; united, indivisible proletarian co-operation, the united party, for the proletarians of all nationalities of the state in question.

A co-report was delivered by G. L. Piatakov. His viewpoint was that national schisms and the aggravation of the national question were survivals of the epoch of feudalism and the period of the struggle of the rising bourgeoisie against feudalism. To the extent that the epoch of developed capitalism and imperialism raises the question of the social revolution, to that extent the national question disappears, since under Socialism there can be no national separations and the developed industrial countries will necessarily constitute a unified economic organism. The slogan of the separation of nations must be replaced by the slogan: "Down with Boundaries between Nations and States."

Felix Dzierzynski, holding to the traditional standpoint of the Polish Social-

Democracy, turned against the resolution proposed by Lenin by trying to show that nationalist aspirations are reactionary and that the struggle for the social revolution would put aside the separatist aspirations of the small nations.

The record of Lenin's speech on the National Question is extremely inaccurate and full of gaps.—p. 310.

175. This refers to Lenin's article "On a Caricature of Marxism and on Imperialist Economism," which was written in 1915. See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII.—p. 312.

176. The reporter on the situation in the International was Zinoviev, who sponsored a resolution which was then adopted by the Conference. In reference to the third "Zimmerwald" Conference the convocation of which was planned for May 18, 1917, the reporter expressed himself for participation in this conference in order better to be able to come to an understanding with the Liebknecht group, unify the Zimmerwald Left and at the conference itself to break with the "centrist" majority on the occasion of big, basic questions, as for example, the question of the Stockholm Conference which had been proposed by Borghjerg, and to organise the Third International in the further course of development.

Lenin's amendment proposed to "stay in the Zimmerwald Union solely for the purposes of information." The Conference rejected this amendment and adopted Zinoviev's resolution unchanged. (See the resolution among the appendices in Book II.) Lenin's speech at the conference is very briefly and inaccurately reported.—p. 315.

177. This refers to the Third "Zimmerwald" Conference planned for May 18, 1917. This conference did not take place until September 5, 1917 in Stockholm and its sessions were rigidly conspiratory. The Russian delegation consisted of the following members: From the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks—Vorovsky (Orlovsky) and Semashko (Alexandrov); from the Organisation Committee of the Mensheviks, P. B. Axelrod and Panin (the last two left the Conference even before its close, since they did not agree with the resolutions of the Conference); from the Menshevik Internationalists, Ermansky; from the Polish Social-Democracy (National Committee), Radek and Hanecki. From Germany there were Georg Ledebour, Hugo Haase, Käthe Duncker, and others. In addition, the following countries were represented: Rumania, Finland, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden and Norway. Lindhagen was the chairman. The agenda included the following points: 1. Report of the International Socialist Commission; 2. The struggle for peace and the attitude of the Zimmerwaldians to it; 3. The Grimm Affair; 4. Attitude towards the Stockholm Conference. It was decided that the decisions of the Conference were binding also for those parties that were not represented at the Conference but which belonged to the Zimmerwald Union. The basic question of the Conference was how to give real support to the Russian Revolution. The Conference issued a proclamation appealing for an international general strike against the war and for the protection of the Russian Revolution: "Either the Revolution will kill the war, or the war will kill the Revolution." The Third Zimmerwald Conference in Stockholm was the last of the Zimmerwald International Union.—p. 315.

178. See *Imperialism As the Final Stage of Capitalism*. Written by Lenin in 1915, the first Russian edition of this book appeared in 1917. A revised English translation will appear in Vol. XVIII of Lenin's *Collected Works*.—p. 320.

179. See J. A. Hobson: *Imperialism*, London, 1902.—p. 320.

180. This refers to the book *Against the Stream*, a collection of articles by Lenin and Zinoviev written during the war. Lenin's writings during the years 1914-1916 will be found in Vols. XVIII and XIX of his *Collected Works*.—p. 320.

181. The draft of "Proposed Changes in the Theoretical, Political and Several Other Parts of the Programme" was probably written a few days before the April Conference; "Concerning the Remarks of the Committee" was written a week after the Conference. Lenin probably wrote the comparison of the old and the new text of the programme ("Draft of Revised Programme") also at this time. The introduction to the pamphlet, as well as the footnote (see p. 325), Lenin wrote on June 2, 1917. For the sake of simplicity, all of these articles, although written at different times, are printed together, disregarding the chronological sequence which has been otherwise followed in this volume. The "Remarks of the Commission on the General (Theoretical) Part of the Programme" may be found among the appendices in Book II.—p. 325.

END OF BOOK I

